

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

REPORT OF STATE ASCS CONFERENCE

Vermont State and County Committeemen, County Office Managers,
County Agents, and Guests

Held at Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, April 23 and 24, 1964

Foreword

This report presents the highlights of the talks and actions taken at the 1964 State ASCS Conference. This, our 26th conference of county committeemen and county office managers, was held to discuss some of the changes which have taken place in ASCS programs over the years. These changes have been made to meet changing conditions in agriculture. Ways and means of doing a better job and to help make a better Vermont were discussed by speakers and those attending the conference.

We were honored by the presence of Philip H. Hoff, Governor of Vermont, and Mrs. Hoff at the conference banquet. We appreciate their taking time from a busy schedule to be with us.

We were also honored to have Ray Fitzgerald, Deputy Administrator, State and County Operations, ASCS, of Washington, as guest speaker at the banquet. His talk emphasized the great responsibility placed on county and community committeemen in administering the varied programs offered by the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The conference sessions and the banquet were well attended by county committeemen, county office managers and persons representing the various cooperating agencies.

We appreciate very much the work and wholehearted cooperation of everyone who helped in any way to make our 1964 State ASCS Conference a success.

State ASC Committee

Richard A. Moore, Chairman
J. Paul Bonneau, Member
Morris E. LaFrance, Member
Robert P. Davison, Ex Officio

State ASCS Office

A. F. Heald, State Executive Director
Charles B. Doane, Fieldman
George T. Hart, Fieldman

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The following are excerpts from the President's message on agriculture to the Congress of the United States, delivered January 31, 1964:

"American agricultural economy is the most productive in the world. Its efficiency is constantly increasing. One American farmer today provides 25 domestic consumers and four people overseas with their total food and fiber needs. His output has increased 130 percent since the end of World War II - almost three times the gain in non-farm productivity. The consumer as a result must spend a smaller percentage of his budget to meet his food needs than ever before in our history.

"The statistical totals can be deceiving.

"The income of the average farm family is still only 55 percent of that received by the average non-farm family.

"Steadily rising costs are still eating up the major portion of the increase and gross farm income, forcing upon the farmer a cruel cost price squeeze.

"Almost one-half of our nation's poor live in rural areas.

"Farming communities have three times the proportion of dilapidated and substandard homes as the rest of the nation.

"Three-quarters of those employed as farm laborers earn less than \$2000 a year in cash wages from all sources.

"Our task, therefore, is three-fold; first to maintain and improve farm income, strengthening the family farm in particular; second, to use our food abundance to raise standards of living both at home and around the world; and, third, to accelerate the development and conservation of both material and human resources in rural America where one-third of our citizens live.

"Policies to strengthen the economy of rural and urban areas must go hand in hand. Prosperity on the farm gives impetus to prosperity in the city. New uses of land and water which are no longer required to produce food and fiber can serve the needs of both urban and rural residents."

PROGRAM

1964 STATE ASCS CONFERENCE

April 23 and 24, 1964

HOTEL VERMONT, BURLINGTON, VERMONT

First Day

9:00 a.m. Register, get name tags and banquet
to tickets at Conference Registration
10:00 a.m. Desk

Conference Opened by J. Paul Bonneau, Presiding

10:00 a.m. Conference Goals Richard A. Moore,
Chairman, State
ASC Committee

10:15 a.m. The ACP -- Past, Present, Future H. L. Manwaring,
Deputy Director,
CLU Policy Staff,
ASCS

Questions and Answers

Milk Break

11:15 a.m. Some Challenges to Committeemen Harry A. Peters
Northeast Area
Director, ASCS

Questions and Answers

12:00 noon Lunch

Richard A. Moore, Presiding

1:30 p.m. Watershed and Recreation Projects L. J. Peet, State
of SCS Conservationist, SCS

Questions and Answers

2:15 p.m. Making the Most Out of ACP Wildlife Roger Seamans,
Practices Federal Aid Coordinator,
Vermont Fish and Game
Service

Questions and Answers

Milk Break

First Day (Continued)

- 3:00 p.m. Some Ideas on ACP Forestry Practices A. W. Gottlieb, Vermont
Director of Forests
and
Raymond Foulds,
Extension Forester
- Questions and Answers
- 3:45 p.m. How County Agents and Committeemen Robert P. Davison,
Can Work Together on RAD Director of Extension
- Questions and Answers
- 4:30 p.m. Adjourn

CONFERENCE BANQUET

Toastmaster - Raymond G. Rowley

PROGRAM

Recognition - County Committeemen

Group Singing

Guest Speaker - Ray Fitzgerald;
Deputy Administrator,
State and County
Operations, ASCS

Honored Guests

Governor and Mrs. Philip H. Hoff

Second Day

Morris E. LaFrance, Presiding

9:30 a.m. The State Department of Agriculture
and ASCS

Raymond G. Rowley
Commissioner of
Agriculture, Vermont

Questions and Answers

10:00 a.m. USDA and Civil Defense

Richard Holmes,
Deputy Director,
Civil Defense, Vermont
and
Noah Thompson,
Rural Defense Informa-
tion Specialist

Questions and Answers

Milk Break

11:00 a.m. Working with Vocational Agriculture

Cola Watson, Supv.
Vocational Agriculture
Education

Questions and Answers

12:00 noon Lunch

Richard A. Moore, Presiding

1:30 p.m. Discussion of Current Programs

A. Wheat, ACP

Led by C. B. Doane,
Fieldman

B. Wool, Feed Grain

Led by G. T. Hart,
Fieldman

C. Conservation Reserve,
Livestock Feed

Led by A. F. Heald,
State Executive
Director

3:45 p.m. Adjourn

CONFERENCE GOALS

By Richard A. Moore, Chairman, Vermont State ASC Committee
At the State ASCS Conference
Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont
April 23, 1964

I am pleased to welcome you county committeemen, county office managers, and guests. This conference has been planned so that we will have no working committees as we have had in previous conferences. Instead, it will consist of talks by well-qualified men on the subjects selected. There will be ample time for discussion following each talk. The Friday afternoon session has been reserved for discussion of the technical details of our ASCS programs.

We are proud of the fine record of participation in ACP enjoyed by farmers in Vermont. Our State again leads the Nation in percentage of cropland participating in ACP with 73 percent. Credit for making this record possible goes to the fine work of our county and community committeemen.

The record of the committee system in Vermont has been excellent, and it was accomplished by our interested, hard-working county and community committeemen and county office people.

THE ACP - PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

Address by H. L. Manwaring, Deputy Director,
Conservation and Land Use Policy Staff, ASCS
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 23, 1964

First, I would like to congratulate Vermont on its record of participation and accomplishments under the Agricultural Conservation Program. Vermonters are "champs" in the nation for the percentage of cropland participating in ACP.

The past, as far as ACP is concerned, is valuable only for discussion and as a guide to the future.

The slides which I am going to show portray the accomplishments of the various practices offered under the ACP nationally and the accomplishments in Vermont.

1. Grass and legume cover established and improved:

National - 800 million acres - Farmland in all States through Texas and north except North Dakota and one-half of South Dakota.

Vermont - 1.6 million acres - Farmland in all Mass. and one-half Conn.

To protect the soil against wind and water erosion and for land use adjustment.

2. Woodland improvement:

National - 6.4 million acres. More than 25 pulp mills.

Vermont - 70 thousand acres.

3. Water storage reservoirs:

National - 1.8 million - 36,000 for each of 50 States. Surface area about size of Lake Ontario. Over 12.5 times Lake Champlain.

Vermont - 2,295 - 14+ per county.

Water and wildlife conservation.

4. Sod waterways:

National - 317,000 miles - 12 trips around the world.

Vermont - 104 miles - Distance to Errol, New Hampshire.

5. Terraces:

National - 1.6 million miles - 7 times to moon.

Vermont - 133 miles - Distance to Greenfield, Mass.

6. Stripcropping:

National - 111 million acres.

Vermont - 3,000 acres.

7. Watersheds:

a. National

- (1) 1157 numbers.
- (2) 503,000 farms.
- (3) 113,000 participating - 1962.
- (4) \$20 million - 1962.
- (5) \$91 million - 1955-62.

b. Vermont

- (1) 3 watersheds.
- (2) 119 farms in watershed.
- (3) 70 farms participated - 1962.
- (4) \$12,900 in cost.

In regard to ACP at the present time, the regular program should be examined and revised from time to time. The recent program planning meetings held in Vermont are a democratic way of assuring that the ACP is formulated at the grass roots. As far as special projects under ACP for the 1964 program, they must be confined to conservation objectives. Any special projects must meet a conservation need recognized by the people of the community as being vital. People should be kept informed of any special projects and the results of these projects should be publicized. I would like to describe an ACP special project in South Carolina. The county ASC committee earmarked \$5000 for pooling agreements to assist Negro farmers in Colleton County, North Carolina. The greatest single recognized need in the community was to have some means of improving drainage of 75% of the cropland in the community. A small flood which had occurred recently crystallized group opinion. A cost-share formula was worked out predicated on the amount of acreage each participant would have involved in the project. The local SCS technician determined that two outlet ditches were needed, and the project was divided into two pooling agreements. One of these agreements involved 12 farms - 2 miles of ditch and 11,000 cubic yards of earth removal. The second project involved 8 farms with 1.3 miles of drainage involving 7300 cubic yards of earth removal. The practice participation in this project amounted to 41 1/3 acres per participant. The problem of financing the producer's share was solved by local banks, two private lenders, the Production Credit Association and the Farmers Home Administration. It was agreed by all participants in this agreement that these projects would not have been possible without ACP assistance.

The following are possibilities for special ACP projects:

- a. Increased assistance to farms with greatest need for ACP assistance.
- b. Clean streams.
- c. Long-term ACP agreements.
- d. Abatement of sedimentation problems.
- e. Timber stand improvement demonstration.
- f. Cooperation with SCD plans.

There are many other possibilities also.

As far as the future of ACP is concerned, it is a little obscure at present. Basic legislation allows up to 500 million dollars annually for the ACP. Under past programs, 250 million dollars have been appropriated. The ACP story needs to be told and understood by the general public, farmers and the Congress. The conservation job is not yet completed and we need to conserve our soil and water resources to sustain our growing population.

As for the needs in Vermont, three out of each five acres of cropland need some sort of conservation treatment:

- a. Erosion control is needed on one of each three acres.
- b. Excess water control is needed on one of each five acres.
- c. Soil condition needs improvement on one of each ten acres.

On Vermont pastures two out of five acres need treatment:

- a. Better cover establishment is needed on one out of two acres.
- b. Pasture improvement is needed on one out of five acres.
- c. Drainage is needed on one out of five acres.

As for new directions in which ACP may travel, more emphasis is needed on land use adjustment and long-term agreements and emphasis should be continued on recreation and wildlife practices.

ACP is insurance for the future. The spending under ACP programs has a multiplier effect. Assuming that 400 million dollars are spent by farmers and Government under ACP in a given year, the multiplier effect usually is considered to be two and one-half to three times the investment. Two and one-half times equals more than one billion dollars per year in small conservation oriented businesses. This helps:

- a. Grass and legume seed dealers.
- b. Equipment suppliers.
- c. Fertilizer manufacturers, distributors and retailers.
- d. Handlers of pipe, tile, wire, cement, chemicals and small engineering equipment.
- e. Tree seedling producers.
- f. Custom tree planters, stand improvement and other custom service operators.
- g. Wages or salaries paid to laborers, mechanics, clerks, technical workers and transporters.
- h. Dividends to stockholders, interest and taxes.

These are some of the things that benefit through this multiplier effect brought about by cost-sharing assistance which goes into the hands of farmers who are establishing those practices.

The periodic use of conservation/^{cover}of grasses and legumes is needed on 423 million of the 448 million acres of cropland. If these needs were adequately met, several million more acres would be in grasses and legumes each year.

ACP now offers cost-sharing for water conserving and water disposal practices on a more restrictive basis than the authorization of the Act. Most drainage practices are carried out to insure a crop in wet years rather than for the purpose of substantially increasing annual yields of crops. The net effect on the production of crops giving supply management problems is to reduce the supply management problem.

In conclusion let me quote, "It is not enough to have a good aim in life. You have to pull the trigger."

SOME CHALLENGES TO COMMITTEEMEN
AND COUNTY OFFICE MANAGERS

Address by Harry Peters, Area Director, Northeast, ASCS
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 23, 1964

I. Introduction

- A. It is a pleasure to attend this conference, my first in Vermont.
- B. We recognize that Vermont enjoys some very significant "firsts" in the ASCS family.
 - 1. Vermont leads the nation in the percent of its farmers and cropland enrolled in the ACP.
 - 2. Vermont's Senatorial leadership for the ACP certainly is of "No. 1" importance in sustaining this vital program.
 - 3. The extensive use of community committeemen in the operation of ASCS programs in Vermont ranks high on the list of your accomplishments.
- C. Ray Rowley's appointment as Commissioner of Agriculture from the position of State Committee Chairman may also be a "first." We are very proud of Ray and his work both as Chairman and as Commissioner.
- D. I should also like to recognize the fact that Vermont is the home of the former Area Director, Harris Soule. We miss him greatly in Washington. His many friends extend their greetings and wishes for many days of good fishing.

II. Today's Challenge to County Committeemen and Office Managers.
"Better Administration of Farm Programs." (Slide #1)

- 1. President Johnson has stressed efficiency and economy in Government operations.
- 2. Secretary Freeman and Administrator Godfrey have asked that every effort be made to carry out the President's request and have pledged their support.
- 3. How can we get increased efficiency and economy in our County Office operations? We can, through Management Improvement.
- 4. There is a poster on a wall down in the Department. It asks the question - What is the largest room in the world? The answer is "Room for Improvement."
- 5. Management Improvement is not a new subject. But a fresh look is necessary if we are going to realize improvement in efficiency and economy.

6. Take a fresh look by asking yourselves:

- a. Do you really want to improve?
- b. Do you recognize the need to improve?
- c. Are you willing to change old habits?
- d. Are you willing to pay the price in time, study and work?

You will need to face these questions if you are serious about management improvement.

- 7. A "positive" approach to management improvement is necessary if results are to be obtained.
- 8. We should make good management a habit. It needs continuous attention. If we don't improve then we are left behind.
- 9. The prime requisite for management improvement is attitude or desire.
- 10. Leaders must believe improved management practices are necessary.
- 11. This is true at any level in ASCS - county, State or the Washington Area Office.

III. ASCS Leadership Places Top Priority on Management Improvement. Let's briefly review what has been done. (Slide #2)

- A. The report on the Farmer Committee System revealed certain weaknesses in our organization. Every effort is being made to improve.
 - 1. In November of 1962, ASCS was reorganized to better serve field offices and farmers.
 - 2. In March of 1963 a communications survey was made to find ways to improve communications systems at all levels in ASCS - Work is still going on to strengthen communications.
 - 3. The Self-Appraisal Survey in April 1963 was designed to improve service to farmers through a review of committee and employee responsibilities.
 - 4. A training officer and staff was placed under DASCO and a comprehensive training program began.
- B. Accomplishments (Slide #3)
 - 1. More responsibility is being placed on State and County Committees. The new Price Support Program is a good example - this will soon be placed in operation for 1964 crops.

2. Intensified orientation and training of county and community committeemen has been carried out in all States. (Vermont results)
3. Progress with the training program has been very good in all States.
4. Writing improvement workshops completed in all States and county workshops are being held.
5. In Washington all program handbooks are being rewritten to simplify and clarify instructions.
6. Electronic Data Processing equipment at New Orleans is being used increasingly for routine clerical work.
7. New telephone and telex systems have speeded communications between State and Washington offices.
8. A special analysis of operations is being made to seek ways to improve management in State offices.

IV. Specific Challenges to Committeemen and Managers for Better Administration (Slide #4)

A. Committeemen

1. Accept responsibility and authority given by law and policy. Your responsibility extends to both the farmers you serve and to the law and policy from which you derive your authority.
2. Give fair and equitable treatment to all. Election by fellow farmers places Committeemen in position of public trust.
3. Keep abreast of farm needs and problems of your county and inform the State Committee.
4. Inform yourself about ASCS programs and keep farmers and others informed about them.
5. Set policies that adapt ASCS programs to county conditions and needs.
6. Adopt high management standards for county office operation to give better service to farmers. Follow up to see that standards are maintained.
7. Work closely with community committees and make them a member of the "team."
8. Cooperate with and assist other agencies working with farmers.

B. Managers (Slide #5)

1. Many of the challenges that apply to committeemen also apply to managers. Managers deal with the day-to-day problems. They are in a good position to make immediate and long-range management improvements in the county office.
2. In the county office, management improvement means "getting more and better work done through people at the right time with less effort and cost."
3. Develop a good understanding of agriculture in your county, State and the Nation.
4. Know the programs you work with. This is essential if farmers and employees are to have confidence in you.
5. Develop work improvement skills. We must continue to test and improve our methods of operation.
6. There are many "little things" that reduce effectiveness of operations such as: Causing farmers to make extra trips to the county office, getting involved in unnecessary red tape, extra time spent in transferring information from one record to another.
7. As managers you can make periodic reviews of your operation.
 - a. Select one specific job at a time.
 - b. Analyze the way you do it now.
 - c. Question every detail.
 - d. Improve and simplify methods of handling each job.
 - e. Work with other employees to get them involved in work changes that affect them.
8. Develop leadership abilities. A good leader develops teamwork.
 - a. Set office goals with employees.
 - b. Help your employees reach these goals, through planning and organizing.
 - c. Coordinate workload between employees.
 - d. Maintain sincere interest in people and practice good human relations.

9. Develop communication skills. Speaking, writing, reading and listening, all the basic tools of our trade. You should know them well. Good communications help build good public relations.
10. Develop ability to train people in job skills. Training is a good investment in people. It is the best source of management improvement and efficiency.

V. Goals for the Coming Year (Slide #6)

We can achieve better administration of farm programs and better service to farmers. This is our challenge and to meet it we should set goals.

- A. People in management positions should develop a positive attitude - there is room for improvement and improvement will be made.
- B. Committeemen set high standards of administration and service at both State and county levels.
- C. Keep informed on farm problems and programs and see that all farmers are fully informed.
- D. Set policies that adapt our programs to county conditions.
- E. Managers develop and carry out better management practices.
- F. Develop leadership and communication skills.
- G. Provide adequate training.

WATERSHED AND RECREATION PROJECTS OF SCS

Address by L. J. Peet
State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 23, 1964

Two members of the SCS staff are with me this afternoon and each of us will review certain aspects of watershed and recreation projects being carried out. Richard Hopkins will discuss recreation projects, Gerald Welsh will talk about watershed work, and then I will review the White River Resource Conservation and Development Project.

RECREATION PROJECTS IN VERMONT

I am to review with you what we have been doing in recreation. The first thing that comes to mind, when considering reviewing what we have done in recreation, is the Cropland Conversion Program.

When this program was first announced there was much interest. The number of applications that could be accepted were limited. There was little trouble in getting enough interested persons to submit applications. If I remember correctly, there were 48 requests in all, eleven of which were approved by the State ASC Committee and Washington. Of these 11, only three now have contracts.

Basic Conservation Plans were completed on these farms shortly after applications were received. To date, little has been done toward the carrying out of these plans. Due to the timing of the introduction of the Cropland Conversion Program and the time involved in getting applications, preparing basic plans, and finally the contracts, it was well into the winter and past the construction season.

All three of these plans have been developed around the idea of camp sites or tenting areas. Two include the construction of ponds and one the enlarging of a pond presently on the site. It is planned that these will offer swimming and fishing. Tent sites will be established in connection with all three plans; sites for trailers will be set up in at least one. It is my understanding that the landowners of these projects are anxious to get started with construction as early as possible so that they may open for business at the earliest possible date.

Aside from the Cropland Conversion Program there has been a lot of interest in income-producing recreation. A number of basic plans have been prepared for units where recreation is being contemplated. Some have actually started construction and others are planning to start this spring. Most of the interest seems to be in setting up tenting or camping areas with varying degrees of facilities available.

In September 1963, we sent a questionnaire to all our field offices seeking information on income-producing recreation in the State. A summary of these showed the following:

1. 51 SCD Cooperators established income-producing recreation enterprises during FY 1963.

2. District Cooperators switched from dairying to recreation as a primary source of income (involving approximately 2,832 acres of land and 7 cooperators).
3. 19 District Cooperators said they plan to convert from present farming operations to recreation as a primary source of income - (this will involve approximately 7,500 acres of land).
4. 121 others said they were considering adding recreation to their regular operations.

This will give you some idea of the amount of interest there has been in income-producing recreation. If this interest will continue, is anybody's guess.

During a recent trip to Michigan, I had an opportunity to talk to SCS people from the Northeast and Cornbelt States. It seems to be a general feeling among these people that recreation and dairying don't go together very well, the principal reason being time. They both need the greatest amount of attention at the same time. Combinations with sheep, beef, cash crops, etc., seem to be the most satisfactory.

Up to now we have been talking about income-producing recreation, now let's take just a moment and look at non-income-producing recreation. This I don't feel is new. We have been helping people build ponds, establish wildlife practices and other such things for a long time.

To date, some 4,450 farm ponds have been built in Vermont. Many of these are used for recreation.

We have assisted in the establishment of 35,528 linear feet of cutback borders. We have helped develop 4,239 acres of wildlife habitat and we have assisted in stocking over 600 farm ponds.

In 1963 there were 147 referrals received from you for wildlife ponds, 104 were approved and 41 were constructed. The total of referrals for wildlife ponds this year is 220.

We have been, and are more and more, helping summer people who have bought land in Vermont for its recreational value, not for income-producing recreation but for family recreation. We help them plan their land and then we help them carry out the plan. Many of the practices called for in these plans may not be closely related to recreation but I feel that to the owner they must have some recreational value. They get a great deal of pleasure in talking about them.

WATERSHED PROJECTS

Watershed projects under Public Law 566 have been important to hundreds of rural communities throughout the United States. Where upstream flood drainage or drought problems afflict small watersheds, the local leaders seek assistance through the watershed protection flood prevention act and very often look to ASCS committeemen for leadership as well as for financial assistance in the installation of soil and water conservation practices.

This is the background of a sound watershed approach. This is the tenth anniversary year for Public Law 566, the Small Watershed Act. This provides for upstream watershed projects which are locally initiated and usually a multiple purpose design. It needs considerable cost-sharing for accomplishment and certainly the project must be justified on a cost benefit basis.

There must be local need, local initiative and local cooperation to establish and construct a watershed project.

There is currently activity in the following small watershed projects in Vermont: The Neshobe in Rutland County, the Brown's River project in Chittenden County, and the Jewell Brook project in Windsor County.

Public Law 566 has been amended and the latest amendments provide for recreation as a possible part of a small watershed project.

Cost-sharing for dams, recreation facilities in connection with flood prevention purposes may be available. Where recreation is provided, the requirements are that there be public access, a limited number per project and that the use of these facilities be made at reasonable charges.

Recreation is fast becoming a major industry in Vermont. Public Law 566 with new provisions may well assist in this and in other purposes.

WHITE RIVER RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

- A. A new approach to assisting with the development of natural resources to create new jobs and increase income in rural areas.
 1. Is area or community approach versus the individual farm or family approach. (Is similar in this respect to RAD. Is similar to watershed area approach.)
 2. Funds are specifically provided for inventorying resources, for assessing opportunities, for presenting alternatives to local people and for helping them prepare a plan. This help to local communities is under the direction of a project coordinator.
 3. The Secretary of Agriculture has directed the several USDA agencies to fully utilize their programs in helping with the planning and carrying out of projects. The project coordinator is responsible for coordinating USDA agency help at the project level.
 4. The emphasis in carrying out the plan approved by the local people is on use of private capital, local and State public funds, and full use of applicable federal programs. RC&D funds are provided for certain uses after the other possibilities have been exhausted. These uses include technical services, loans, and cost-sharing for flood protection where watershed projects are not feasible.

- B. This is a pilot type project. They were authorized in the 1962 Act. Only 10 have been authorized nationally. Whether or not there are more depends upon the outcome of the 10 projects.
- C. Where it is. 23 towns in the watershed of the White, Ompompanoosic, Waits and Wells Rivers. The sponsor is the White River Valley Association.
- D. What will be in plan of local people
 - 1. Agriculture offers no opportunity for increased employment.
 - 2. Forestry and wood-using industries may offer some opportunities long-time.
 - 3. Greatest opportunity is developing area as a place to live and recreate. Major emphasis will be on those things that result in such a development.
- E. Success - Local people must be wholeheartedly in support of plan; local associations must have a good promotional program; there has to be a lot of teamwork among USDA agencies and among local, State and federal agencies.
- F. ASCS nationally has said it would:
 - 1. Encourage ASC Committees to assist in developing local leadership and in arranging for appropriate sponsorship of projects.
 - 2. Further objectives, by making use of cropland conversion program as appropriate.
 - 3. Use ACP cost-sharing to encourage land use adjustments and conservation practices that are part of plan.
- G. In addition to what I have mentioned, County ASC Committees in the area could help provide certain information through their community committeemen. You may hear from us later about this.
- H. ASCS is a member of USDA TAP's. The entire White River Project is served by one Panel and it will coordinate efforts of USDA agencies. The State Panel will help achieve coordination at the State level.

MAKING THE MOST OUT OF ACP WILDLIFE PRACTICES

Address by Roger Seamans, Federal Aid Coordinator,
Vermont Fish and Game Service
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 23, 1964

It has been extremely gratifying to see wildlife practices included in the ACP programs. For some time purely fish or game values had to come as by-products of agricultural or forestry practices. Today land-management requires that all natural resources must be given consideration in planning implementation of a program. This is especially true in Vermont where our greatest product is Vermont, an all inclusive resource valued by both residents and non-residents alike.

Land use has certainly changed during the past twenty years and so has land-ownership. Residents of Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and a dozen other States value Vermont country more than many of us who are privileged to work and live in it year around. One has only to look at present prices for non-profitable farms, cut-over timber lands and parcels that appear to only hold the rest of the State together to realize what we really have.

The wildlife practices included in the 1964 Vermont Agricultural Conservation Program were selected because they were practical and would enhance the land. Water areas, if properly constructed and managed, contribute to our resident waterfowl population. This is a plus factor that benefits all of Vermont and not just the individual landowner. The same comments can be made for the old field and woodland border practices. We have heard a great deal lately regarding the need for maintaining existing openings and thereby insuring that Vermont scenery will not become less attractive. Inter-spersion of land use types is all important if we are not to become a State of woodlands, thanks to farm abandonment, government assisted tree planting and the soil bank. ACP has a partial solution if mowing of previously hayed fields is approved by the county committees and utilized by the non-farming, summer resident.

Being more specific, let us briefly discuss the four practices which are designated as wildlife practices. The first of these is a titled development or restoration of shallow water areas for wildlife. For years personnel of the Vermont Fish and Game Department have asked for an opportunity to show landowners that the movement of an equal volume of fill could create a very attractive marsh instead of the drain wet area which would only produce a few more bales of hay to add to the surplus already at hand. Many times we have tried to convince people that a muskrat house, an early arriving pair of mated mallards, the later brood of ducklings and the late summer use of the area by black ducks was a value worth considering. Add to this the beauty of the brown fluted heads of cattail, the giant burr reed which quickly volunteers into areas, the increased song bird population and the winter use of a safe place for skating. One of our department's greatest difficulties in failing to derive this type of use from these areas was our failure to have personnel readily available to work with the landowner when planning was under way. Today we see many people in various land use agencies becoming aware of uses other than solely agricultural and with the additional incentive of federal cost-share assistance. Wet areas are becoming a reality. It is extremely important that these shallow water areas have some deep water adjacent to the structure.

By deep I mean at least 3 feet in depth to insure that emergent vegetation will not completely choke the entire development. There must also be fence to exclude cattle and it is best that the fence be kept back a short distance from the flow line so that a natural vegetative accumulation of the past season's growths will be present for nesting cover. These shallow impoundments most certainly will attract such species as mallards which are ground nesters and will nest relatively close to the impoundment. The planting of any products within the proposed flowage is absolutely unnecessary because the good Lord above provides a very fine assortment of plants as soon as the water is impounded.

The construction of dams or ponds for wildlife provides the landowner with an opportunity to create a small impoundment which can be used solely for fishing. These should be made of sufficient depth to insure that sufficient water will be present under the winter's accumulation of ice and also that the inflow of water is sufficient to provide the required amount of oxygen. Ponds built to one side of a water course, with the water being brought into the pond through a perforated pipe laid in the bottom of the brook, has proven to be a very desirable type of fishing impoundment. It is also said that brook water is sufficiently aerated and you also have reduced the need for spillway capacity to the absolute minimum in these cases. Good spring seeps can also be developed for fishing impoundments but there is a greater risk that these may be limited in oxygen content during the winter months or that the inflow during the summer may be so low as to permit undesirable maximum temperatures. Fish ponds require some prior planning and perhaps a discussion with a fishery's biologist as to the calculated result to be obtained.

Managing land to improve wildlife habitat or feed is basically a new type of practice included to meet Vermont's problems. One has only to drive a few miles in any direction from Burlington, Montpelier, St. Albans, Rutland or Brattleboro to soon realize a number of acres of hayland no longer is utilized. These old mowings quickly revert to brushland and then become restocked with inferior species. The net result is the loss of the opening, the loss of edge which is so important for game and also the loss of scenery which was present when the opening and the adjoining forest land existed. The practice was written to help defray the cost of maintaining these openings. It also was noted that several alternatives are given which include either the actual mowing or the opening once every three years or perhaps the use of herbicides to control brush and tree species which volunteer in the old field. This certainly is not a costly practice but it is one that will pay considerable dividends in the years to come if it is utilized.

This same practice also includes a cost-sharing division for the release cutting of wild tree and tall shrub species to develop maximum dependable yields of food for wildlife. This is geared primarily to the release of old orchards and individual apple trees which so frequently are found on Vermont hillsides where farms previously existed. These old apple trees will produce a multitude of food for all species of wildlife but they can not do this if they are being overtopped by poplar, grey birch, pine, fir or some of the other tree species which quickly fill in the openings.

I am somewhat disappointed in reviewing the list of wildlife practices that are offered by Vermont counties in 1964 to find that only three counties found it possible to include this practice on their approved list. I am sure the other eleven counties have plenty of old mowings that warrant mowing once in three years to maintain them as an opening.

The establishment of cut-back borders is a fourth practice which was included with the knowledge that it might not have too much use or appeal. Its value to wildlife is great but the effort to accomplish it is perhaps greater than what many landowners care to undertake. One can remember back a few years ago when this was a practice included in soil conservation service plans as a head ground or turn around for equipment when used to cultivate a field. What we are trying to accomplish with a cut-back border is to provide that shrubby edge between the opening of the field and the forest land behind it. It is in this edge that wildlife finds its best habitat because here food and shelter are relatively close together. Within the forest land itself the canopy is usually closed and only more tolerant shrubs can grow. Even these will produce a minimum amount of fruit because of the lack of sunlight. The removal of trees from a strip perhaps 40 feet in width bordering a field permits the natural shrubs to grow without suppression. This edge becomes a favorite spot for deer, rabbits and ruffed grouse. Perhaps the mention of deer has already caused this practice to lose a great deal of its appeal and for this I apologize.

Cut-back borders are not a practice that can be carried out one year and then forgotten. Tree species quickly volunteer into this cleared strip either by seeding, root sprouts or sprouting from the cut stumps. This need for maintenance can be reduced considerably by the treating of the tree stumps that were cut with a selected herbicide to insure that sprouting will not occur. Nevertheless, a few days every two or three years will be required to cut back those tree species which occur within the shrub border to make certain that only shrubs are permitted to grow within this strip.

It is hoped that these comments may be of some assistance in the planning of wildlife programs within ACP districts and any questions which I can answer at this time I will gladly do so and also the Fish and Game Department stands ready to be of assistance wherever it possibly can in land management programs. We must quickly admit that we do not have the personnel to deal as often and as long with the man on the land as we would like, but we still offer to do whatever is possible.

SOME IDEAS ON ACP FORESTRY PRACTICES

Resumé of Address by A. W. Gottlieb,
Director of Forests, Vermont
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 23, 1964

A copy of this talk is not available. The following points were emphasized:

A great deal of progress in the establishment of tree planting and woodland improvement practices has been made with the help of ACP and the CRP programs in Vermont. Approximately 18 million trees have been planted on Vermont farmland with the assistance of ACP cost-sharing. Over 9 million trees have been planted on land which is in the Conservation Reserve with the assistance of cost-sharing under this program.

The percentage of ACP program funds used for woodland practices has increased from .41 of total funds in 1950 to 12.07 of the total funds available in 1962. This is a desirable trend in using more ACP funds for long-range woodland practices.

The transfer of ACP program funds to the Forest Service under technical service agreements has been of real assistance in getting additional forestry help to service ACP referrals. At the present time, the transfer under these 1% agreements represents only a small portion of the total cost of servicing ACP referrals on forestry.

Some of the difficulties involved in growing nursery stock for planting on Vermont farms are that it takes from three to four years to grow the stock which is sold to landowners and to plan for the demand three or four years in advance creates a real problem. At the present time, there is a surplus of nursery stock.

24

SOME IDEAS ON ACP FORESTRY PRACTICES

Address by Raymond Foulds, Extension Forester
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 23, 1964

"ACP Work in Maple Stands"

I think that we can say as far as Vermont is concerned that maple and maple products are the thing that most people are aware of. Almost anywhere in the world if you mention Vermont the first thing that comes to the mind of a person concerning Vermont is the matter of maple sugar or maple syrup. We are known for the quality of our maple products as well as for the quantity, and this trait of quality is not just true of maple. It's also true of other things that we do in Vermont. I think it's the kind of reputation we want to encourage both in maple and in other things that we make and do.

We Vermonters are also known as a prudent people. We accept new ideas and new things rather slowly, and then we don't accept them unless we are sure they are going to work. We are also known as a frugal people making the best of everything we have, and making things last and serve their purpose before we throw them away in favor of something newer.

With regard to the maple resource in Vermont, we can recognize that it is an unlimited, renewable resource, that it can prove in future a decided source of new income as long as the product that is made can be sold at a profit. The maple trees, if properly cared for, will continue to grow for years, and if properly tapped, we can get much good, pure sap from them with which to make maple products.

Unfortunately, in past years we find that in Vermont as well as the rest of the U.S. the number of trees tapped has declined. In 1943 a total of 9,500,000 trees were being tapped in the U. S., but by 1959 this total had dropped down to 4,500,000 trees. Of this 4,500,000 trees, 1,993,000 were trees tapped in Vermont. In looking forward to 1964, sugar makers have been optimistic because of the rather open winter and not much snow. It was easy to get in and tap. However, in spite of this, we may find that the number of trees tapped and the number of buckets hung in 1964 will be even less than has been the case in the past, and was the case in 1959.

To compare the amount of syrup made in the U. S. in the past and present we can say that in 1940-44 the average production of syrup was about 28 million pounds. However, by 1955-59 this had dropped down to 17 million pounds, and by 1960-61 the average production was 14,500,000 lbs. In 1963, a short year, it was even less than this, the production being only 12,500,000 lbs. Production in Vermont in 1943 was 5,600,000 lbs. of syrup and sugar. By 1959 this had dropped down to 2,400,000 lbs.

Of course, we can say it is inevitable that the number of sugar bushes tapped and in operation will decline as the number of farms decline. We know that the number of farms has declined very definitely in Vermont and that the number of farmers are fewer in number. However, the production of milk has stayed pretty well up because the production per cow

has increased, the quality of feed has increased, and the productivity of the average worker has increased. We can't say this is so with the maple industry, for although the number of sugar makers are fewer, these sugar makers don't necessarily produce more syrup per sugar maker than they used to years ago. There is one reversal in this picture, and that's the development recently of central evaporation plants. These plants are usually defined as places where the sugar maker not only boils down his own sap, but buys additional sap from neighbors and boils that down also. Usually these plants are larger than average and are located along main highways. The purpose of such location is to provide an opportunity for maple products to be sold easily to tourists or other visitors who may stop by at the sugar house. Some sugar houses also have a candy kitchen from which are sold maple products and other products which can be used as souvenirs and gifts.

I believe that there is a possibility for an increase in the maple industry in the future. This depends on several things. One thing is the ability of the present sugar maker to adapt new practices and become more efficient than was the case in the past. It also depends on the success we may have in competing with syrup brought in from Canada. It also depends upon how rapidly this central plant idea develops, and it depends to a considerable extent also on the amount of new research it is possible to do that will bring findings of better, more efficient ways of not only to tap trees but also make syrup and to sell syrup.

Regarding this matter of help available from research and other sources, we are fortunate that in Vermont we have the finest research establishment for maple found anywhere in the world. This has been going on for almost 100 years, and some outstanding papers have been published giving results on studies of the maple enterprise. Currently work being done at the Proctor Maple Research Farm in Underhill is bringing us new ideas each year on how to tap the tree, how to better process syrup, how to use new equipment, and how to do a better and more economical job of producing a product to sell.

With the help of the Extension Service in disseminating the information arrived at by research people, it is possible for sugar makers to help themselves do a better job from day to day and year to year. It is assumed that the Extension Service or the County Agents will continue this type of help in the years to come, but we also have, of course, other workers with other services who are providing help too. We have, for example, the CFM, or "Cooperative Forest Management" Program, under which the County Foresters are employed. This program is administered by the Dept. of Forests and Parks in Montpelier, and federal money obtained for it comes through the U. S. Forest Service to the State. In addition to the County Foresters, of course, are Consulting Foresters, who are men who are trained foresters but are in business for themselves. These men must charge a fee that will pay costs and also make a profit for them in order for them to stay in business.

Of course, we in ACP work know that the County and Consulting Foresters work very closely together in carrying out the ACP practices in tree planting, timber stand improvement, and fencing of woodlands. We

know that the county forester in each county must approve practices that ought to be done, and we do know that this program has been increasing in popularity, and that in this current year more money is being spent of the total amount available for ACP work in the State for the purpose of forestry than has ever been the case before.

It might be interesting to analyze the accomplishments of the CFM Program carried out by the county foresters. On our chart here we see columns for three different years and other columns for Vermont and New York. Under the New York and Vermont columns we compare the accomplishments of the county foresters in the two different states.

SUGAR BUSHES IMPROVED
CFM* PROGRAM

YEAR	VERMONT		NEW YORK	
	No. County Foresters	Acres	No. County Foresters	Acres
1961	13	392	8	875
1962	11	322	8	438
1963	11	258	10	222
	<u>35</u>	<u>972</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>1535</u>

Counties at greatest fault - Grand Isle, Rutland, Caledonia, Windsor.
(972 acres improved in Vermont. Potential of 32,000 acres (1600 sugar makers and 20 acres per sugar bush). Still a long way to go.))

*Cooperative Forest Management.

We know that in 1961 thirteen county foresters in Vermont worked with woodland owners in improving 392 acres of sugar bushes. At the same time in the same year eight county foresters in New York improved 875 acres of sugar bushes. Just why there was such a big additional acreage for New York, we don't know. In 1962 only eleven county foresters in Vermont helped woodland owners improve 322 acres while at the same time eight county foresters in New York were helping woodland owners to improve 438 acres. In 1963 eleven county foresters in Vermont helped sugar makers improve 258 sugar bush acres, while at the same time ten county foresters in New York helped sugar makers improve 222 acres. In both states we know that the acreage of sugar bushes being improved is gradually reducing, and in Vermont we, for some reason, do not seem to do as good a job as they did in New York. The total, as you can see on the chart, is 35 county forester years, or portions of them, used in improving 972 sugar bush acres over the three year period from 1961-63 in Vermont; while at the same time 26 county forester years, or portions of them, in New York were being used to improve 1535 acres of sugar bush. If we have to point any long accusing finger, we might indicate that Grand Isle, Rutland, Caledonia, and Windsor Counties have done the least amount of work in improving sugar bushes in Vermont. Of course, Grand Isle shouldn't be expected to do much - there just isn't that much acreage of sugar maple in that county. However, it is surprising that Rutland and Caledonia Counties, who have two of the most active sugar maker associations in the

State, have done less than many other counties; and that Windsor County, which is a county with quite a few sugar makers in it, has improved very few acres of sugar bush during those years.

We wanted to try to analyze the potential of the number of acres of sugar bush that should be improved in Vermont, but to do a real job, we might say that if the average sugar bush has 20 acres and that there are 1600 sugar makers, which is a figure given us recently by the Vermont Dept. of Agriculture, then we know that there are about 32,000 acres of sugar bush that potentially need improvement. It looks like, in a three year period under the CFM program, we only improved 972 acres. Possibly prior to that, without help of county foresters and by themselves or through other programs, 2,000 acres were improved. But this still would mean only a total of 3,000 acres approximately of sugar bushes improved in Vermont. It would seem as though we have at least 29,000 acres still to go. Maybe what we need to do in order to accomplish this is to make better use of our ACP program; to encourage our county foresters to put a little more of their time on sugar bush work rather than other work, since, after all, Vermont is best known for its maple, and its maple depends upon its sugar bushes. Perhaps, we should also encourage our consulting foresters to do more work of this kind, and maybe the way to do it is through our local community ACP committees. These committees are at a very strategic position to put pressure on these foresters where it will do the most good.

We might ask ourselves what else we might do as ACP workers to help the maple situation in Vermont. Well, we can certainly recognize the situation involved with competition with syrup coming in from Canada, which in the last year that we know about was something like 18 million pounds, and was more maple syrup than we were making in this country ourselves. This syrup was offered for sale at prices much below the going market price for Vermont or New York or other U. S. syrup, and the field price, of course, paid by the large packers is lower, even for the Fancy syrup than our costs of making maple syrup, which is about \$3.75 per gallon for drum syrup. Of course, for retail syrup we need to do what we can to obtain reasonable prices for our syrup, and we need to do everything we can to become more efficient in making syrup at a lower cost.

We might ask once again, "How can ACP help?" Well, as we've said, to try to get more thinning done - that is the most important practice - in young, full-sized stands of maples, and whether it can be done by testing the sap of the trees first with a refractometer, which tests just one drop of sap for sugar content, or in lieu of this with a sap hydrometer, which of course, must be used with a hydrometer cup, and this means waiting while the sap flows until you have enough. Possibly this practice of testing trees and then thinning according to the test, removing the trees testing lowest is quite a costly one. Maybe there should be a special ACP practice for thinning according to the best scientific practice where sugar trees are tested first before being cut in a thinning.

We might ask ourselves further, "Is cost-sharing sufficient the way it's set up now in Vermont for forest practices, especially sugar bush practices?" In New Hampshire the payment is \$18 an acre maximum for thinning mechanical weeding, or cull removal. In Rhode Island (in comparing States) they pay

70% of the cost, but not to exceed \$21 per acre. In New York they pay 70% of the cost not to exceed \$20 an acre for thinning, 70% of the cost not to exceed \$15 per acre for releasing, or weeding, 70% of the cost not to exceed \$10 per acre for cull removal, and 70% of the average cost of wire and posts for fencing. Now this latter practice compares with our current payment of 40¢ per rod for 2-strand fence, and 50¢ per rod for 3-strand fence. Maybe we should re-analyze once again our practice for fencing. Is this realistic in the light of New York's practice and in the light of present day costs?

To compare the foregoing cost-sharing, of course, with Vermont we must remember that Vermont presently pays, or recommends payment of, 70% of the cost not to exceed \$20 an acre for either thinning or releasing in young maple stands.

We might ask ourselves one final thing about what ACP might do to give special impetus to the maple industry in the State. How would it be if a special push were given for youth to do a better job of sugar bush improvement; and to do more of a job of such improvement? Could a sugar bush improvement contest be started with the help of the Vermont Maple Sugar Makers Association and perhaps a special award from ACP? Such a contest was once operated by the Vermont Maple Sugar Makers Association and the County Foresters alone. It did not get very far - perhaps it lacked proper leadership. Possibly a new contest, being cooperatively conducted by the ACP program, the Extension Service, and the County Foresters, might be successful.

In conclusion, I would like to mention once again that Vermont is known internationally for its maple. We can capitalize on this in many ways, and we should not allow ourselves to slip in any way. We want to do all we can to promote production and sale of the best maple we are possibly able to make. We need to solve the marketing problems in the maple industry, particularly for drum syrup. This Canadian competition is a very serious thing. It's a major cause of low prices, especially for drum syrup. The solution seems to be that we need to raise the tariff to about 6¢ per pound on syrup coming into this country, or establish a quota of about 10 million pounds per year. This would cut down by about 8 million pounds a year the amount of syrup that is currently coming into this country.

In looking ahead further in what we should do about the maple industry, we need to promote and to publicize Vermont maple at every opportunity, and we can further help to improve the situation by (a) encouraging County and consulting foresters to give priority to sugar bush improvement; (b) encourage sugar makers to give more attention and time to improving sugar bushes than they have in the past; (c) give thought to increasing the maximum cost of a practice where trees are thinned after first testing them for sweetness. This would make possible the employment of consulting foresters to help sugar makers who wish to improve sugar bushes this way, and get this kind of scientific practice under way, at least for a trial period. This would mean Vermont would be a pioneer in a completely broad new approach to improving sugar bushes for production of the sweetest sap; and (d) we might develop a youth project to encourage young people to improve sugar bushes. This could be developed in such a way that it would be cooperatively conducted by the ASCS, the Extension Service, and the County Forester program.

HOW COUNTY AGENTS AND COMMITTEEMEN CAN WORK TOGETHER ON RAD

Address by R. P. Davison, Director of Extension
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 23, 1964

1. What RAD is.

- A. Helps people develop total human, natural, industrial, and other resources of an area.
- B. A system of inventorying all resources--human and other--taking a look at opportunities, and then taking action.
- C. It is a "people" centered program, broadly based, with their ideas built in.
- D. It is the focal point that brings together the people and their problems and ideas with the "helps" that are available from federal, state, and private sources.

2. The RAD process.

- A. Secure facts relative to an area and analyze them for development purposes.
- B. Set goals and priorities for the area.
- C. Develop alternatives of methods to reach these goals.
- D. Decide what alternatives to follow in developing an action program for the area.

3. RAD committees.

- A. State--a resource committee made up of a broad section of interest groups including state agencies, federal agencies, and private citizens. This committee sets guidelines for local groups, approves them as official RAD groups when requested. It approves all OEDPs and all ARA requests relating to agriculture and all ARA requests needing such approval.
- B. Executive committee.
- C. County committees made up similarly to state committees.
- D. Area committees--one for the Northeast Kingdom and one for the White River Valley area.

4. Technical Action Panels.

- A. State--made up of the USDA agencies and Extension. Mr. Peet is chairman.
- B. Counties--USDA agencies and Extension. The chairmanship varies between Farmers Home Administration and SCS personnel.

- C. These groups are charged with the responsibility of providing technical information and service to local development groups. They are thought of as on "tap" and not on top. Their job is to bring the best resources of the USDA agencies and other state groups to the assistance of locally formed development groups, RAD groups, etc.
5. Specific assignments to Extension.
- A. Organizational leadership--where people are helped in getting the facts, discussing and analyzing them, setting alternatives, and organizing groups.
 - B. Educational leadership. This is done as the educational arm of the USDA and seeing to it that RAD process is understood, that large numbers of people take part in the activity, and that after organizations are set up they continually get up-to-the-minute information that will be helpful to them.
 - C. Technical Action Panel membership.
6. Specific assignments to ASCS.
- A. Technical Action Panel member.
 - B. The cropland conversion program.
 - C. Adjusting ACP and cost sharing programs to put emphasis where needed on land use changes and resource change and development.
7. Working together.
- A. Suggest that every effort be made to understand the RAD program and process and that if possible this be discussed at a meeting of the County ASCS Committee at some time in the near future by the county agricultural agent or others who may be available.
 - B. Discuss the roles of the Technical Action Panel members, again at a meeting of the County Committee.
 - C. As citizens of the state be sure to take part in all discussions called by RAD groups, become a member of these groups, and do your part to help bring about a sound resource development plan for your area.
 - D. County committees should take a long look at how they can keep a sound balance between practices for strictly commercial agricultural enterprises and for those areas where a changed land use and resource adjustment is badly needed. Such practices as forestry, wildlife, recreation, and other income-producing ones that will lead to maintaining the family farm as a unit should be fostered.

- E. County committees and county agents should do their best to think of new practices that can be used to help in this land use change and resource adjustment situation. These practices should be logical and sound and as helpful as possible to those who no longer will be producing fluid milk.
8. By working together county committeemen and county agents can through the RAD program:
- A. Help people to see their way to solving area resource development problems.
 - B. Improve rural areas through the wise use of land, including recreation and agricultural land.
 - C. Improve total income for the family farm and the area as well.
 - D. Continue to keep rural Vermont a better place in which to grow our most valued product--boys and girls.

Excerpts from Talk by Ray Fitzgerald,
Deputy Administrator, State and County Operations,
ASCS - USDA

I am glad to be here in Vermont and to visit with county committeemen and county office managers attending this State conference. I have attended many State Conferences, however, this is the first one which I can recall attending that had the Governor of the State present.

I want to talk to you about the committee system. County and community committeemen are elected as you people know. This system is unique. There is no other system like it in operation in the world today. The details of ASC committees are not understood by the general public and most people know little about the operation of ASCS. Programs that are administered by ASCS are extremely important to the economy of an area and it is our duty and obligation to make sure that the public knows what it is and how it operates. The committee system provides for latitude and decisions at the local level. Committeemen must have knowledge of all programs which they administer and a thorough understanding of agriculture in the area. You, as county committeemen and office managers, should treat each farmer as a customer. Committees have a monopoly on agricultural programs and farmers cannot go down the street to get the same service if they are dissatisfied with the services offered in the county office. You must treat farmers fairly, courteously and equitably. Personality and personal matters should not interfere with the daily business of the ASCS county offices. Equitable treatment of farmers is highly important at the county level. Each farmer must be treated exactly the same. County office people are the heart of the organization and farmer-elected committeemen are the soul of ASCS.

You all know well the story of agriculture. This is a great story. I want to congratulate Mr. Keith Wallace of the Vermont Farm Bureau for the fine work that he did at the National Farm Bureau meeting in helping to preserve the Agricultural Conservation Program. Committeemen have a responsibility not only to act as good committeemen but as good citizens. They should be active in farm organizations and let organization heads and their Congressional representatives know what they want in the line of farm programs.

It has been thoroughly proven that the committee system works. However, it is highly important that the public be well informed as to the functions and activities of the committee system and that county office managers and committeemen do their best to administer programs fairly and equitably among the farmers participating.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND ASCS

Resumé of Address by Raymond Rowley, Commissioner of Agriculture
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 24, 1964

In the past farmers have not received their fair share of the economy and it is high time that farmers increased their economic status. The only way that farmers are going to accomplish this is by getting together and organizing for this common purpose.

The ACP has been a big help to Vermont farmers and the fact that Vermont leads the nation in ACP participation indicates that the program is well adapted to Vermont conditions. There is a need for continual personal contact with farmers under the ACP program. Farmers should be informed to a better extent on what ACP is accomplishing and what it can do in the future.

The demands on farmers will be greater. In 1975 it is expected that there will be around 230 million people in this country. The policy of the U. S. Department of Agriculture is to help family farmers and to continue this important strength in this nation. We do need a reserve supply of food in order to keep this country strong and to survive in troubled times and in periods of emergency.

The recreation business in Vermont has certainly enhanced the value of rural properties. Vermont should take every opportunity to increase this type of use for Vermont land.

The new Federal milk code and fewer water requirements are already a challenge to Vermont farmers and they need help in the development of sources of pure water for farm use.

In order to help as many farmers as possible to stay on the land, the ASCS should do all it can to assist and aid as many farmers as possible to continue in farming.

THE USDA AND CIVIL DEFENSE

Resumé of Address by Richard Holmes, Deputy Director,
Civil Defense, Vermont
at the ASCS State Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 24, 1964

The following accomplishments have been made in Vermont under the Civil Defense Program:

1. There is a licensing and marking program for community shelters and some of these shelters have been stocked.
2. The corps of engineers are resurveying the shelters in some of the small towns to look for additional shelter space in these areas.
3. There is a training for special skills program, such as a shelter management course being held to train people to take charge of shelters in case of an emergency.
4. There is a shelter allocation program which is designed to make full use of shelters and to appoint those who are to use certain shelters in each area.

The State of Vermont is No. 1 in the United States for marking and stocking shelters. All of the supplies in these shelters are provided by the Federal Government. Things that are under way or planned are:

1. To complete a home shelter survey in order to determine home shelter facilities available.
2. The protection of radio stations. Conalrad is now out and the emergency broadcasting stations have taken over this function. Emergency broadcasting stations are selected stations which will maintain power and give complete coverage of an area in case of emergency. There are plans now for setting up eight emergency broadcasting stations to cover Vermont.

Military reserve personnel have now been designated as a support group and reserve officers can now work in civil defense groups and earn points in their reserve status.

Additional new developments are that the defense functions have now been removed from the office of the Secretary of Defense and are now placed under the Secretary of the Army. The National Guard will assume more responsibility for civil defense functions. They will act in this capacity until they are actually placed on Federal duty in case of emergency.

Approved shelters holding 50 or more people have been stocked. The general idea today in civil defense is to make preparations for a natural disaster and if we do this, we will be prepared for war or any other emergency situation.

THE USDA AND CIVIL DEFENSE

Talk by Noah Thompson, Extension Rural
Defense Information Specialist
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 24, 1964

I have been asked to talk on "How Can Farm Families Participate in the Civil Defense Program," "Ways of Protecting Livestock on the Farm" and "How Can County Defense Boards Help in Carrying Out These Programs?"

First, I would like to touch on why I think we should be concerned with Civil Defense preparation.

We all dread another crisis as occurred during the Cuban scare in 1962. At that time people suddenly faced possible nuclear war. The telephone rang constantly with excited people asking "What do I do now?"

When Civil Defense officials couldn't be reached, police and town or city officials were called. A typical answer was, "If you find out where a fallout shelter is located, let me know." Or, as in the case in one city where the Civil Defense plans had been lost, citizens were consoled with "The plan wouldn't have worked anyway."

I am sure that here in Vermont people didn't get as excited as in other places and that answers were far more intelligent, but what I am trying to point out is that there is no such thing as "instant Civil Defense." Neither is there anything magic about it. I certainly don't have any cure-all. It takes long hours of planning, cooperation, and understanding by many people with a constant renewing and reviewing of plans to keep them up to date, and the people up to date with the plans.

We have come a long way since the Cuban crisis, both in planning and understanding, but still many people have settled back into the same state of apathy. Some say, "It can't happen here. We've never been invaded nor had a bomb dropped on us. The government or the military will see to it that nothing happens."

A new type of warfare has been developed. If war comes, our country will be attacked. It will not only affect the area bombed but the entire country will have radioactive fallout to contend with. We cannot run away from this, but we can protect from it if we plan ahead.

Is there a possibility of a nuclear attack? We certainly hope not and it is very unlikely. But who here or anywhere can say it can't happen? Cuba was an example--where a miscalculation of the other side's intent could have caused it. Other ways: Accidental possibilities. A small police action develops into one. Smaller nations getting access to nuclear weapons increase the possibilities. If Krushchev is replaced the situation could change. A Red-China-Russian showdown. There are too many possibilities to sit back and say it can't or won't happen. So our responsibility seems to be to prepare for an attack just in case it does happen.

Furthermore, a prepared country--one that has the ability to survive and retaliate--would cause any enemy to think "long and hard" before attacking us.

One of the biggest objections we hear against preparation is: "What's the use? There will be nothing left to live for--it will be just an area of devastation."

According to research experts the major effects on land production will be limited pretty much to the first year--even in heavy fallout areas. After that it could be very much back to normal production.

You have heard the saying, "The land will be here to till if the people are here to till it." If this is the case, our emphasis should be on survival--survival during the first few days when fallout is the most critical--by far the most fatal.

Adequate shelter is the difference between life and death. Adequate shelter means heavy material between you and the deadly gamma rays that have fallen in the area. It means a place to live until these rays have decayed to the point where it is safe to come out. 7 hours - 1/10; 2 days - 1/100; 2 weeks - 1/1000.

Perhaps there is no better way for County Defense Boards to give support in this area than--on how farm families can prepare for survival and secondly how they can protect their livestock.

How can farm families participate in the Civil Defense Program? How do we get busy people interested in a program that they may never need? There is no easy answer! There is no substitute for involvement. Why not start by involving key farm families in County Civil Defense Programs?

Most counties have "key family" lists of farm people in connection with the Emergency Rural Communications System as a means of information between Defense Boards and farms. They should feel that they are part of a program--that they are needed. These families should feel responsible--be given information to keep them up to date through newsletters, meetings, and direct contact. Windham County is a good example--they have been doing just this.

They should know the duties and responsibilities of the County USDA Defense Boards. They should know about the County Disaster Board and how this can help the farmers. Certainly, they should understand the local Civil Defense organization and how it functions. Some no doubt are already a part of the local Civil Defense government.

Farm families can be encouraged to develop family survival plans--not elaborate ones, but they could pick the "safest place" and plan around that for a home shelter. They should know how to add protection to this and understand the principles of radiation and shielding; provide food and water; sanitation; fire equipment and first aid. Preparations like this mean survival.

If these key families are prepared, it could wear off on others--not overnight--it may take a long time. After all, this isn't a crash program but a long-range one--one that most families should finally accept.

Protecting Livestock on the Farm

Naturally, the family's safety is the most important. However, the recovery of the nation can very well depend to a great extent on the ability of the farmer to continue production. Food is one of the greatest morale boosters.

There are a number of reasons why the dairy industry would be vital to our nation's recovery:

1. Meat, milk and milk products are produced simultaneously.
2. These are foods that are now eaten in everyday living so we are used to them.
3. Milk, of course, is the most nearly perfect natural food and we could survive on this alone.
4. Protected cows would provide a safe source of food during these months following a disaster, and they are relatively easy to protect from fallout compared to other food sources.

Dairy farming in the Northeast is rapidly changing--remodeling and new building plans are common. Consideration should be given to protective measures. Steps that help include such items as:

1. Banked sides or thick walls to absorb the fallout rays,
2. Stalls for cows toward the center of the barns to get distance between cows and fallout.
3. Silos and milkhouses along the sides of barn.
4. Baled hay overhead.
5. Sprinkler system on roof.
6. Facilities to scrape or wash surrounding yard.
7. Covered water source for drinking supply.
8. Auxiliary power.
9. Possible fallout shelter in barn. (Plans are available.)

Emergency measures could include placing bales of hay along walks behind cows. Wetting down this hay will give added protection because of the extra weight.

The future of agriculture following a nuclear attack has been much debated. I would like to quote from the summary of the Department of Defense research that was presented to the House Committee on Armed Services last year by Assistant Secretary of Defense, Stewart L. Pittman.

"The major effects on agricultural production appear to be pretty much limited to the first year following attack. After that period farmers will be able to work their fields, even in areas originally heavily contaminated. The contamination of growing crops by radioactivity is estimated to be a minor problem. The most serious is the possibility of high concentrations of iodine 131 in milk during the first few weeks after attack. The calculations suggest that adults would receive an insignificant exposure but that it would be desirable to keep infants in areas of milk contamination on dried milk products for the first 6 months--the surplus and wholesale stocks of dried milk products would meet this requirement of infants with adequate planning. The problem of distribution is one which requires more preparation.

"Calculations indicate that strontium 90 doses resulting from consumption of foods grown in very heavily contaminated areas would be at least 1 million times less than a lethal dose. Other possible hazards, such as cesium 137 and carbon 14, appear considerably less hazardous than iodine and strontium.

"Even within the first year, effects on agriculture may not be critical. A denial of the land by high gamma radiation levels for a period of as much as 2 months might be serious at harvest time, or planting time, but no barrier otherwise to making that year's crop.

"A study of a wide range of possible nuclear attacks shows that perhaps 30 to 70 percent of the farmland might be subject to a denial time of as much as 2 months; that is, that they could not farm that land for a period of as much as 2 months.

"An attack during planting or harvesting time would lose part of the national harvest, but by no means all of it. Current food stocks are sufficient to bridge gaps of at least 9 months, perhaps closer to a year, with reasonably effective rationing. Surplus grain would prevent starvation for twice this period. So we do not anticipate mass starvation or critical malnutrition if sensible preparations are organized in advance."

Perhaps this summary is too optimistic and we certainly won't deny the seriousness of the effects on Agriculture but it shows there is plenty of hope for recovery.

Suggestions for County Defense Boards in Helping to Carry Out This Civil Defense Program

Secretary Freeman has spelled out the importance of the Defense Boards' responsibilities as delegated to the U. S. Department of Agriculture in the foreword to the County Handbook. He states: "Our objective is to help the United States survive and recover." He further says, "I consider it the duty of all USDA personnel to support the Civil Defense effort.

In USDA our defense responsibilities are a definite part of all current programs, with equal priority with the programs themselves."

Boards can be expected to offer leadership by involving other key farmers in these programs by giving them responsibility and information, as I have said before. Defense Boards should maintain liaison with local and district defense organizations. There are no doubt some Civil Defense workers that have never heard of the USDA Defense Boards.

We often hear that there are "just too many agencies" working in Civil Defense. They overlap and are, therefore, inefficient and confusing. Each agency has its own job to do--the only overlapping should be in a common goal to develop understanding and promote Civil Defense program. A correlated approach by all concerned is needed. Approach should be problem--and objective--oriented--not agency oriented.

You might consider the possibility of a County Civil Defense Advisory Board made up of members of the County Defense Board, the district coordinator and town chairman. There may not be a place for more committees but this could accomplish much with enough enthusiasm. Some States are doing this. Their plans are to make existing educational programs known--such as medical self-help and adult education--also, to develop rural readiness plans and such Civil Defense programs.

Public relations is of the utmost importance. We must develop ways of keeping Civil Defense before the people. Public opinions can be changed--a one-hour session or a news release helps to do this. Generally, once people understand Civil Defense measures, they are sold on it and stay sold.

Through joint efforts, we can get people to: Become aware of and understand the threat of nuclear and natural disaster; to learn the fundamentals of radiation and protective measures; to develop a survival plan; and to be prepared to act on this knowledge in time of emergency.

It is going to take a great effort over a long period of time, but if we need to exert this effort to prevent an attack or to survive if one does occur, then I am sure we will all agree that this work is vital.

WORKING WITH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Resumé of Address by Cola Watson, Supervisor,
Vocational Agriculture Education
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 24, 1964

The occupation of farming has changed over the last thirty years to where much more than brawn is required to be a success in farming. Today more than ever before a farmer must be highly educated in this business and possess many manual and management skills. Agricultural business is much more than just farmers. There are 7 million farmers and farm workers and another 6 million are working in related services.

There are a broad horizon and many opportunities for those who are trained in agriculture. The Department of Vocational Agriculture Education serves the following:

1. High school students preparing to farm.
2. High school students preparing for off-farm related agricultural services positions.
3. High school students preparing for advance study in agriculture.
4. To establish young adults in the business of farming.

The purpose of vocational agriculture is:

1. To attain and maintain a high degree of science needed in agriculture.
2. To prepare farmers as businessmen.
3. To maintain programs and develop new programs in vocational agriculture education.
4. Make vocational agriculture education available to people of all ages in agriculture.
5. To assist persons in agriculture who are unemployed or underemployed in developing needed skills.

The following suggestions are offered to continually improve the cooperation between vocational agriculture education and ASCS:

1. For ASCS to continue to supply Vo-Ag teachers with up-to-date information on ASCS programs.
2. For ASCS personnel to make it a point to know their Vo-Ag teachers personally.
3. To inform Vo-Ag teachers of any unprinted materials available in county ASCS offices, such as county statistics, participation in programs, etc.
4. ASCS people should contact student teachers at student training centers to inform them of the programs and furnish them with information about these programs.
5. For ASCS personnel to be available to talk to schools throughout the year.

The 1964 Voluntary Wheat Program *

President Johnson recently signed into law a new voluntary Wheat Program designed to help maintain the income of wheat farmers.

The new program offers to wheat producers who participate:

- Payments for diverting wheat acres to conservation uses.
- Price support through loans and purchases.
- Cashable certificates for wheat to be consumed domestically.
- Cashable certificates for wheat to be sold for export.

As a wheat producer you may take part in the program or not, as you choose.

Winter wheat producers who seeded wheat last fall, as well as spring wheat producers, may participate.

Since the program is voluntary, you will need to sign an application and agreement if you want to take part in the program. There is no automatic participation.

Here is the voluntary Wheat Certificate Program for 1964:

1. Farm allotment and normal yield. Your 1964 wheat allotment and farm normal yield are those issued prior to the marketing quota referendum held for the 1964 wheat crop in May 1963. Your farm wheat allotment is based on a National wheat acreage allotment of 49.5 million acres.
2. Diversion of acreage from wheat. If you produce an acreage of wheat within your farm allotment and devote an acreage equal to 11.11 percent of your allotment to conserving uses (in addition to the farm's normal conserving acreage), that percent of your acreage will be classified as acreage diverted from wheat. (The reason for using 11.11 percent of the 1964 allotment is that this percentage is the difference between the 1964 and 1963 National wheat allotments.)
3. Farm conservation base. A farm conservation base has been established for each wheat-producing farm. That base is the usual acreage on the farm devoted to conservation crops and uses. Participation in the 1964 Wheat Program will mean maintaining in conservation uses the number of acres in your farm's conservation base along with the acreage you divert from wheat to conserving uses.
4. Approved conservation uses. In general, the approved conservation uses for diverted acreage include:
 - A. Permanent-type or rotation cover of grasses and legumes.
 - B. Temporary cover of grasses and legumes.
 - C. Wildlife food and habitat plantings.
 - D. Trees and shrubs.
 - E. Other conservation uses.

* Presented at 1964 State ASCS Conference by C. B. Doane.

A list of approved conservation uses is available in your ASIS county office and will be given to each participant. On diverted acres, control of erosion, weeds, rodents, and insects is a responsibility of the producer.

5. Additional diversion. As a participating wheat grower, you may divert additional acres from your wheat allotment equal to not more than 20 percent of your farm wheat allotment. (On farms where 20 percent of the wheat allotment is less than 15 acres, the total diversion may be 15 acres - including the minimum diversion.)
6. Diversion payment. The diversion payment per acre for your farm is 20 percent of the county loan rate per bushel, multiplied by the normal yield per acre of wheat for your farm. The National average loan rate is \$1.30 a bushel. You will be eligible for a diversion payment if you divert to conservation uses as many acres as you indicated in the "Intention to Participate" form at the time of signing up and carry out other program provisions.
7. Substitute crops. You may plant part or all of the acreage diverted from wheat in 1964 to crops approved as "substitute crops" for conservation use. If you plant a substitute crop on your diverted acres, the diversion payment on the acreage used for the substitute will be a percentage of the payment you would otherwise have received. The approved crops and the percentages of payment are as follows: Castor beans, 50 percent; guar, 50 percent; mustard seed, 30 percent; sesame, 50 percent; safflower, no diversion payment; and sunflower, 30 percent.
8. Eligibility for price-support loans and certificates. If you sign up and (A) produce within your farm wheat allotment, (B) keep within your farm allotments for any other crops, (C) produce within the wheat allotment on any other farm in which you have an interest, and (D) meet the program's conservation-use provisions, you will be eligible for price-support loans and certificates. Price-support loans will be based on a National average loan rate of \$1.30 per bushel -- this rate will vary from county to county, as it has in the past.
9. Farm wheat marketing allocation. The wheat marketing allocation for your farm is 90 percent of the normal production of your farm wheat allotment. This is your farm's share of the 1964 National wheat marketing allocation for domestic food consumption and exports. The marketing certificates issued cannot exceed the farm marketing allocation but may be less (See next section).
10. Wheat marketing certificates. Two classes of marketing certificates will be issued to eligible producers:
 - A. Domestic marketing certificates for the part (50 percent) of farm wheat allocation representing food products for consumption in the U. S., and
 - B. Export marketing certificates for the part (50 percent) of the farm wheat marketing allocation to be exported.

The certificates will have a face or cash value in addition to the sale price or the price-support loan value. Domestic marketing certificates will have a value of 70 cents a bushel. Export marketing certificates will have a value of 25 cents a bushel.

Wheat marketing certificates will be issued for an amount of wheat equal to your farm marketing allocation if this amount is not more than the normal production for the wheat acreage actually planted for harvest on your farm. (The normal yield determined for your farm by the ASC county committee is used in this calculation, not the actual yield.)

If the acreage of wheat you plant for harvest multiplied by the normal yield per acre for your farm is less than your farm marketing allocation, any reduction made in the certificates issued will be made, as far as possible, in the amount of export certificates.

However, the amount of certificates you would otherwise have received will not be reduced if your wheat yield is lower than normal because of bad weather or other unavoidable causes.

Suppose your farm wheat allotment is 90 acres and your normal yield is 20 bushels to the acre; your farm marketing allocation is 1620 bushels (90 percent of 90 acres times 20 bushels).

If you plant at least 81 acres (90 percent of your wheat allotment), you would be eligible for certificates for 1620 bushels (81 acres times 20 bushels) -- 810 bushels in domestic and 810 bushels in export. If your yield is below normal because of bad weather -- say, 15 bushels to the acre -- you would produce only 1215 bushels (81 acres times 15 bushels), but you would still receive certificates for the full 1620 bushels (half in domestic and half in export).

If you plant less than 90 percent of your wheat allotment -- say, 60 acres -- you would be eligible for certificates for 1200 bushels (60 acres times 20 bushels). In this case you would receive domestic certificates for 810 bushels (the full amount available), but your export certificates would be reduced to 390 bushels (1200 bushels minus 810 bushels). If your yield is only 15 bushels to the acre -- you would still receive certificates for 1200 bushels (the normal production from the acreage you planted for harvest) even though your actual production was only 900 bushels (60 acres times 15 bushels).

11. Handling the certificates. You may redeem your certificates for cash at the ASC county office. The Commodity Credit Corporation will then resell the certificates to flour millers and other processors who will need domestic marketing certificate for the amount of wheat they mill or process for domestic food consumption. Likewise, exporters will need export marketing certificates for the amount of wheat they export. The necessary export certificates may be purchased from the Department of Agriculture.
12. Signup period. The signup period for the 1964 voluntary Wheat Program will extend through May 15, 1964.

For additional details, see your ASC County Committee.

Wool Program *

A. Background

1. Authorized under National Wool Act 1954.
2. 1955 first year of operation.
3. 1961 - Act extended through 1965 marketing year.

B. Purpose of Act

1. To increase the domestic production of wool to 300 million pounds per year.
2. Provide incentive payments to producers to be applied to the net proceeds received by producers for shorn wool and unshorn lambs.
3. The Act limits the cumulative payments to amount equal to 70% of the duties collected on imports of wool and wool manufactures since January 1, 1963.

C. Provisions

1. Secretary of Agriculture will establish the incentive price each year. This has been 62¢ a pound since beginning of the program. It is 62¢ for the 1964 marketing year.
2. Marketing year is now January 1, 1964 to December 31, 1964.
3. A self-help promotion program to increase the market for wool and lambs. This provides for 1¢ per pound deduction from shorn wool and 5¢ per cwt. from unshorn lambs incentive payment.

D. Calculating Payment

1. Each marketing year the average price per pound for all wool marketed is figured.
2. The percentage increase necessary to bring this average price up to the incentive price is figured.
3. The rate thus obtained is applied to the producer's net proceeds and this is the incentive payment.
4. A payment rate for unshorn lambs to compensate for the wool on them is also figured. This payment is designed to discourage unseasonal shearing of lambs before marketing.

E. Cost

1. On February 1, 1964 payments under the program for the 1962 marketing year totaled \$39,911,000 - \$32,700,000 shorn wool and \$6,414,000 unshorn lambs.

* Presented at 1964 State ASCS Conference by G. T. Hart.

2. Nearly \$3,000,000 a year goes to the American Sheep Producers Council for wool promotion.

F. Program Details

1. Marketing year now runs from January 1 to December 31. Can accept applications for payment through January 31.
2. Be sure to secure complete sales documents.
3. Look over application to be sure the amount of wool sold is in line with number of sheep kept. 8 pounds is National average.
4. Take a look at some of these buyers. Make sure that if wool buyers are applying for payment they actually have sheep.
5. Some local publicity on prices received for wool gets some producers to look for a better market. This could be a joint release by county agent and county committeemen.
6. New list of sheep producers has been prepared. There are 330 in Vt.
7. About 2/3 of these apply for payment.

G. Ways to Improve Wool Program in Vt.

1. Increase participation - 330 producers; 177 participated in 1962. Send a wool information letter to each producer of record, invite him to participate.
2. Help producers get better prices for wool. Get together with county agent to inform producers of going prices - last year varied from 35 to 67¢ per pound.
3. Make payments as soon as possible after they are authorized.

Wool Facts

- A. Number of sheep on U. S. farms averaged about 31,000,000 worth \$500 to \$800 million.
- B. Most of the sheep in the U. S. are in the Western States where over 12 million are located.

There are about 11,000 in Vermont; 8,000 in N. H.; 36,000 in Maine.

- C. Shorn Wool -- U. S.

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. Shorn</u>	<u>Lbs. Wool</u>	<u>Price per lb.</u>	<u>Value</u>
1950	26,380,000	216,944,000	62.1	\$134,623,000
1954	27,672,000	235,807,000	54.9	125,538,000
1962	29,457,000	248,392,000	46.5	115,559,000

- D. U. S. imported 335.4 million lbs. wool in 1961 and exported 316,000 lbs.

Feed Grain Program *

A. Background

The 1964 Feed Grain Program is the 4th year of this voluntary feed grain reduction program. This program on a National scale is designed to:

1. Raise farm income by assuring fair prices for feed grain producers and to provide stability of livestock prices.
2. Continue substantial progress toward the National goal of a 45 to 50 million ton feed grain carryover.

Previous programs are already credited with reducing carryover from 85 million tons to less than 60 million tons.

3. Reduce program costs to taxpayers by reducing the storage cost of grain held in Government inventory.

B. We are all familiar with the operation of the Feed Grain Program. Let's look at the status of this program, nationally and in Vermont. See attached sheet "Accomplishments of the Feed Grain Programs."

C. Job Ahead for 1964

1. Signup completed on March 27. There may be a few late signers.
2. Advance payments are now being made.
3. Measuring needs to be completed by June 20.
 - a. Can measure earlier this year.
 - b. Reporter must be trained to understand the program and to make sure the farmers understand the terms of compliance.
 - c. Flags have been provided for marking field boundaries.
4. Compliance instructions will be sent out by State Office May 10.

* Presented at 1964 State ASCS Conference by G. T. Hart.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

The dramatic increase in feed grain productive capacity in the last decade has created great problems -- problems of overproduction, of market prices and of government costs.

By 1961, the feed grain situation was nearing a production crisis. Most of it concerned corn, of which we had 2 billion bushels in stock. Sorghum grain supplies amounted to 1-1/2 years' supply. Total feed grain stocks were 85 million tons. We were nearing the danger point where these massive supplies would break out and flood the market. Storage costs for feed grains had reached 464 million dollars a year.

So the emergency feed grain bill was passed by the Congress early in 1961, the first piece of legislation signed by the new administration.

It reduced feed grain stocks by about 13 million tons or approximately 475 million bushels. The downward trend in grain prices was stopped and the threat posed to livestock growers by vast quantities of cheap feed was eased.

So successful was this legislation, it has been modified only slightly, and it has been continued through 1965.

Each of the three years 1961-1963, around 1.2 million feed grain producers signed up to participate. In 1961, they diverted 25.2 million acres; in 1962, 28.2 million acres, and in 1963, they signed to divert 25.7 million acres.

Although there was a bumper crop of corn in 1963, feed grain stocks are expected to decline further because of increased utilization. The programs for 1961, 1962 and 1963 have reduced the feed grain carryover from 85 million tons to less than 60 million tons.

For the 1963 crop year, there were 2-1/2 million acres less cropland diverted than there were in 1962. In addition, corn crop yields soared in 1963. As of December 1, the indicated yield was 67.3 bushels per acre, as compared with 64.2 bushels in 1962. Corn production for 1963 is indicated at 4,081 million bushels, a new U. S. record.

The program provisions for 1964 are improved, and should result in participation by cooperating farmers that will bring the Nation's feed grain carryover nearer the goal of 45 to 50 million tons. 1964 - 34.3 million acres diverted.

Had there been no feed grain program, it is easy to figure out what would have happened in 1963: Production of corn, grain sorghums, and barley would have been around 800 million bushels larger if the harvested acreage of the three grains had been the same as in 1959-60 -- before the first feed grain program.

(over)

Total Diversion and
Price Support Payments Earned
1961-62-63 Feed Grain Programs

	<u>1961</u> \$1000	<u>1962</u> \$1000	<u>1963</u> \$1000	<u>Total</u> \$1000	<u>Total</u> Diversion Payment and Price Support <u>1961-63</u> \$1000
U.S.	781,863	843,842	462,853	2,088,558	2,471,487
NE	108	168	290	566	589
VT.	38	49	87	174	178

	<u>1961-64 FGP Signup</u>				<u>1964 Cost</u>
	<u>1961</u> Acres	<u>1962</u> Acres	<u>1963</u> Acres	<u>1964</u> Acres	\$923,134,900 Without Price Support
U.S.	26.7 mil.	32.6 mil.	25.7 mil.	34.3 mil.	
VT.	942	1191	2216	2859	

Carryover Stocks of Feed Grains

<u>1961</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>Goal</u>
84.7 million tons	63.1 million tons	45 - 50 million tons

1964

Final 1.3 million farms to divert 34.3 million acres - represents 41% of the 3.2 million eligible feed grain farms.

Some Facts on The Conservation Reserve Program *

Contracts in Force

We currently have 855 contracts in force on 27,884 acres of land.
26,852 of this is in whole farms and 1032 in part farms.

Annual payments amounted to \$421,187 in 1963 for an average of
\$13.33 per acre.

Acreage Under Contract by Years

<u>Year</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Acres</u>
1956	465	1960	32523	1964	27884	1968	24398
1957	1998	1961	32660	1965	25187	1969	11463
1958	6101	1962	32310	1966	25023	1970	6740
1959	25286	1963	31593	1967	24724	1971	80

Practices Carried Out (Through 1962 program)

<u>Practice</u>	<u>Extent</u>
Seeding grass and legumes	31 Acres
Tree planting	12660 Acres
Ponds	19 Ponds

* Presented at 1964 State ASCS Conference by A. F. Heald

Some Facts on The Livestock Feed Program*

Under conditions of drought, flood or similar disasters, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by law to make available CCC-owned feed grains to eligible farmers in affected areas for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle at not less than 75 percent of the feed grain support price.

Nine Vermont counties through their County Disaster Committees (the Chairman of the County ASC Committee is Chairman of this committee) requested and were approved for livestock feed in March of 1963. 431 applications were approved by the County ASC Committees and 43 carloads of corn were shipped into these counties under the program. This amounted to about 70,000 bushels. This program was terminated on May 20, 1963.

In November of 1963, the Orange and Windsor County Disaster Committees requested that their counties be declared disaster areas for the purpose of receiving livestock feed. This was recommended by the State Disaster Committee for approval by the Secretary. The results in these two counties to date are as follows:

<u>County</u>	<u>Bushels Grain Ordered</u>	
	<u>Corn</u>	<u>Oats</u>
Orange	37,750	940
Windsor	19,250	6560
Total	57,000	7500

The termination date for this program is June 15, 1964. The closing date for accepting applications from farmers is May 1, and the livestock feed must be used not later than June 30.

*Presented at 1964 State ASCS Conference by A. F. Heald

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS 1/
All Counties

1965 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM*

A. PROGRAM POLICIES

1. The general program principles are outlined in the current State or County Practice Handbook. What are your comments on these principles?

All counties voted for the same program principles as in 1964.

2. What changes are needed to make the program work better in your county?

Eleven counties had no suggestions to offer; the remaining three counties commented as follows:

- a. Present community committee chairmen send in list of seven or more nominees. Eligible voters vote for five. These five should then elect their own chairman, vice chairman, etc.
- b. Distribution of State allocation on basis of not exceeding \$600 per farm participating in the State.
- c. Request State Committee to have Vermont Associated deliver bulksread lime from their South Royalton plant. County farmers would be willing to pay a small premium for the better service.

Permit two assignments per farm.

B. PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

In keeping with the above program policies, what practices and cost-share rates are recommended for 1965? (Use last year's practices as a basis for discussion.)

Practice 1 - Lime

All counties voted for the same practice as in 1964.

Cost-share: See table on page 3.

*The questions listed are those which were discussed at the ASCS Program Planning Meetings in the Spring of 1964.

Practice 2 - New Seeding

13 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1964 and one county voted to reduce the cost-sharing on cash practice to the same as CMS. Several counties have agreed to certain stipulations as noted below:

- a. A farmer must use lime or prove by test that it is not needed. (Caledonia County)
- b. Require 2 tons of lime per acre unless soil test shows otherwise. (Essex and Orleans Counties)
- c. Require a minimum of 1 ton of lime per acre treated with cost-shared mixed fertilizer or prove by test it is not needed. (Rutland and Windsor Counties)
- d. Use pH for lime as a guide; no test required when using 2 tons per acre. (Orange County)
- e. Not approved unless lime was used in the previous year or ordered for the current year, or a soil test shows lime is not needed. Minimum pH is 6.5. (Windham County)
- f. Encourage soil tests but do not require them. (Grand Isle County)

Cost-share: See table on page 3.

Practice 3 - Improvement of Hay or Pasture

13 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1964 and one county voted to reduce the cost-sharing on cash practice to the same as CMS. The same stipulations as shown under Practice 2 were made for this practice except that Orange County does not require pH for this practice.

Cost-share: See table on page 3.

Table on 1964 Rates with Recommendations for 1965
for Practices 1, 2, 3 and 19(a)

County	Lime		Mixed Fert.		Super	
	Gov. % Actual 1964	of BS Cost Proposed 1965	Gov. % Actual 1964	of Cost* Proposed 1965	Gov. % Actual 1964	of Cost** Proposed 1965
Addison	50	50	36	36	37	37
Benn.	50	50	31	31	30	30
Cal.	50	50	36	40	37	37
Chitt.	50	50	37	37	37	37
Essex	43	48	32	32	37	50
Frank.	44	44	36	36	37	37
Gr. I.	50	50	35	40	36	36
Lam.	46	46	35	35	37	37
Orange	50	50	36	36	37	37
Orleans	47	47	34	34	37	37
Rutland	46	46	37	37	37	37
Wash.	50	50	37	37	37	37
Windham	P0	P0	P0	P0	37	37
Windsor	46	46	37	37	37	37

*Based on % of cost of contract 0-15-30 or 0-25-25

**Based on % of cost of contract 20% super delivered to RR sidings

Practice 4 - Planting Trees

All counties voted to continue this practice as in 1964.

Cost-share: See table on page 4.

Practice 5 - Woodland Improvement

All counties voted for the same practice as in 1964.

Cost-share: See table on page 4.

Practice 6 - Obstruction Removal

11 counties voted to continue this practice as in 1964; one voted to allow two years to seed; one voted to add the word "walls" along with boulders, etc.; and one county agreed that wheel tractors are farm equipment, making other than wheel tractors eligible, subject to SCS approval.

Cost-share: See table on page 4.

Table of 1964 Rates with Recommendations for 1965
for Practices 4 and 5

County	Planting Trees		Woodland Improvement Cost-share (a)	
	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed
	1964	1965	1964	1965
Add.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Benn.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Cal.	30% NTE \$25M1/	80% NTE \$25 M1//	70% NTE \$15 A1/	70% NTE \$15 A1/
Chitt.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$20 A
Essex	80% NTE \$25M2/	80% NTE \$25 M2/	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Frank.	80% NTE \$25 M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Gr. I.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$20 A
Lam.	80% NTE \$25M3/	80% NTE \$25 M3/	70% NTE \$15 A3/	70% NTE \$15 A3/
Ora.	\$25 M	\$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Orl.	70% NTE \$25M	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Rut.	\$25 M	\$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$20 A
Wash.	70% NTE \$20M4/	70% NTE \$20 M4/	5/	5/
Windh.	70% NTE \$20M6/	70% NTE \$20 M6/	50% NTE \$12 A6/	50% NTE \$12 A6/
Winds.	80% NTE \$25M	80% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$15 A

1/ \$500 limit on forestry practices.

2/ \$20 an acre limit

3/ 5 acres of forestry per farm.

4/ \$150 farm limit.

5/ 70% NTE \$15 A for thinning, removing, and killing and 50% NTE \$15 A for pruning, with a farm limit of \$300.

6/ 20 acre limit on forestry practices.

Table of 1964 Rates with Recommendations for 1965
for Practice 6

County	Obstruction Removal	
	Actual 1964	Proposed 1965
Add.	40% NTE \$25 A or \$150 farm	40% NTE \$25 A or \$150 farm
Benn.	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)
Cal.	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)
Chitt.	40% NTE \$15 A or \$75 farm	40% NTE \$15 A or \$75 farm
Essex	40% NTE \$20 A (\$120*)	40% NTE \$20 A (\$120*)
Frank.	40% NTE \$15 A (5A*)	40% NTE \$15 A (5A*)
Gr. I.	40% NTE \$25 A	40% NTE \$25 A
Lam.	40% NTE \$15 A or \$75 farm	40% NTE \$15 A or \$75 farm
Orange	40% NTE \$25 A (\$150*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$150*)
Orleans	40% NTE \$25 A or \$100 farm	40% NTE \$25 A or \$100 farm
Rut.	40% NTE \$25 A (\$100*)	50% NTE \$25 A (\$100*)
Wash.	40% NTE \$25 A (\$100*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$100*)
Windham	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)	40% NTE \$25 A (\$200*)
Windsor	40% NTE \$25 A	40% or \$300 farm

*Farm limit

Practice 7 - Stripcropping

13 counties voted to continue this practice as in 1964 and one county does not plan to offer it.

Cost-share:

13 counties voted for the same cost-share as in 1964.

Practice 8 - Farm Pond

All 14 counties voted for this practice as now offered.

Cost-share: See table below.

Table of 1964 Rates with Recommendations for 1965
for Practice 8

County	<u>Farm Ponds</u>	
	Cost-share (a) Actual 1963	Cost-share (a) Proposed 1964
Addison	40%	40%
Bennington	40% (\$300* inc. seeding)	40% NTE \$200
Caledonia	40%	40%
Chittenden	40% NTE \$100 dug or \$300 dam	40% NTE \$100 dug or \$300 dam
Essex	40% 1/	40% 1/
Franklin	40% NTE \$60 dug &/or \$150 dam	40% NTE \$60 dug &/or \$150 dam
Grand Isle	40%	40%
Lamoille	40% NTE \$150	40% NTE \$150
Orange	40% 2/	40% 2/
Orleans	40% 3/	40% 3/
Rutland	40% (\$200*)	50% (\$200*)
Washington	40% 4/	40% 4/
Windham	40% (\$200*)	40% (\$200*)
Windsor	40% (\$600*)	40% (\$600*)

*Farm limit

- 1/ Owner must have had at least 10 animal units on the farm during the previous year.
- 2/ \$600 for pond for any one farm.
- 3/ \$200 for dug ponds, \$300 for impounded ponds including spreading the spoil.
- 4/ \$200 including required seeding, fencing, etc.

Practice 9 - Sod Waterways

All 14 counties voted for the same practice as in 1964.

Cost-share: All counties agreed to continue the present cost-share.

Practice 10 - Pipelines

13 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1964; one county recommended that the practice be written to include piping water from any existing or developed source to the barn for use of livestock.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one county for 40%, as in 1964.

Practice 11 - Diversion Ditch

All counties voted for this practice as in 1964.

Cost-share: All counties voted to continue the present cost-share.

Practice 12 - Channel Lining

All counties voted for this practice as in 1964.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one for 40% as in 1964.

Practice 13 - Streambank Protection

All counties voted for the practice as in 1964 with one county recommending that a study be made of the possibility of towns being cost-shared for this practice up to the farm limit.

Cost-share: Nine counties voted for a 50% cost-share for (a) and (b), with one setting a farm limit of \$300; 3 counties voted for 50% for (a) and \$3 a tree for (b); and one county voted for 50% for (a) and \$3 a tree 12-23" and \$4 a tree 24" and over. These cost-shares are the same as in 1964. The remaining county voted for 50% for (a), \$3 a tree for (b), and to add (c) 20¢ per square yard of approved shrubs removed.

Practice 14 - Open Drainage

13 counties voted to continue the practice as in 1964 and one county recommended including in federal cost-sharing installation of a culvert or bridge where it is necessary for the farmer to cross a ditch to another field.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one for 40% as in 1964.

Practice 15 - Tile Drainage

All counties voted to continue this practice as now offered.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted to offer 50% of the cost and one voted for 40%.

Practice 16 - Land Grading

13 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1964 and one county voted to require the use of a land leveler in order to qualify for payment.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a cost-share of 50% of the cost with one of these setting a limit of \$25 an acre, and one county voted for 40%.

Practice 17 - Springs and Seeps

All counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1964.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a cost-share of 50% of the cost. One county voted for 50% for (a) and 40% for (b).

Practice 18 - Special Conservation Practices

3 counties voted to offer this provision, 10 voted against offering it, and one county made no decision.

One of the counties voting not to offer this provision submitted a recommendation from the SCD Supervisor that there be a practice for assisting in the mowing of cropland that has gone out of hay production. If assistance were available, a number of people would be interested and this would be in the best interest of the State as open spaces, especially on back roads, are fast disappearing.

Practice 18(a) - Green Manure

Two counties offering this practice in 1964 voted to continue it in 1965. (Caledonia and Windham Counties)

Practice 18(b) - Mulching

One county offering this practice in 1964 voted to continue it in 1965. (Windham County)

Practice 18(c) - Shrub Control

One county offering this practice in 1963 dropped it in 1964 and voted to offer it again in 1965. (Wincham County)

Another county offered the practice late in 1964 and voted to offer it in 1965. (Chittenden County)

Practice 19 - County Conservation Practices

All counties voted to offer this provision.

Practice 19(a) - Super with Manure

All counties voted to offer this practice as in 1964.

Cost-share: See table on page 3

Practice 19(b) - Weed Control

Application has been made for approval of this practice in one county late in 1964. (Orange County)

One county wishes to offer this practice in 1965. (Orleans County)

Practice 20 - New Conservation Problems

All counties voted not to offer this provision.

Practice 21 - Emergency Conservation Measures

All counties voted not to offer this provision.

Practice 22 - Wildlife Practices

Twelve counties voted to offer this provision and two voted not to offer it. One county indicated that Federal cost-sharing under this provision should not exceed \$300 for any one farm operation and another stipulated that a farmer must select one other ACP practice in order to be eligible for wildlife practices.

Practice 22(a) - Shallow Water Areas

Nine counties voted to continue this practice as in 1964 and five voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: Eight counties voted the same cost-share (a) of 50% with one setting a limit of \$200 and another a per farm limit of \$300. The remaining county voted to offer the same cost-share (a) of 40% not to exceed \$60 for a dug type and/or \$150 for a dam type.

Practice 22(b) - Dams or Ponds

11 counties voted to continue this practice as in 1964; one county voted for the same practice but omitting the word "dams" from title and description; and two counties voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: All 12 counties voted for the same cost-share (a) of 40% as in 1964. One set a limit of \$200 on this cost-share; one a limit of \$300 per farm; another a limit of \$600 a farm; one a limit of \$60 for a dug type and/or \$150 for a dam type; and one a limit of \$200 for a dug type and \$300 for a dam type.

Practice 22(c) - Land Management

Three counties voted to continue this practice as in 1964 and 11 voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: All three counties voted for the same cost-share of 50% as in 1964.

Practice 22(d) - Cutback Borders

Four counties voted to continue this practice as in 1964 and 10 voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: All four counties voted for the same cost-share of 50% as in 1964 and one of these continued the limit of \$100 a farm for this practice.

C. OPERATING POLICIES

1. What arrangements should be made for enrolling farmers in the program?

Thirteen counties voted for farm-to-farm visits and one voted for sign-up meetings.

2. What are your suggestions in connection with breaking down the use of program funds among farmers?

All fourteen counties recommended leaving this up to the county committee.

3. What are your suggestions on the use of 5% and 1% funds?

One county suggested setting aside a certain sum for SCS type practices and having the farmer request cost-sharing a couple of weeks before he plans to carry out the practice.

The remaining counties had no suggestions to make.

4. What minimum soil test requirements should we have before cost-share will be made for:

Lime? Six counties agreed to continue the restrictions in effect in 1964, two do not require a test, and two will allow lime where needed. The remaining four counties commented as follows:

- a. 2 tons unless test shows otherwise.

- C. 4.
 - b. On basis of needs. Two tons unless test shows less is needed. Will be approved for second application if pH is less than 7.2. Must be used on land treated with cost-shared fertilizer unless test shows pH of 6.2 or more.
 - c. Test to be made by recognized testing laboratory and results used in sign-up unless test shows no need for lime.
 - d. A pH of 6.0 to 6.5 requires 1 ton per acre; 5.0 to 5.9 2 tons per acre. May be ordered without test but 2 tons per acre must be ordered. Less or more than 2 tons requires a soil test.

M.F. Six counties agreed to continue the present requirements. The remaining eight counties commented as follows:

- a. Must use lime or prove by test it is not needed.
- b. Must meet lime needs as in 1964.
- c. Encourage test but do not require one.
- d. Use 1 ton of lime per acre of cost-shared mixed fertilizer or prove by test it is not needed.
- e. Use not approved unless lime was used the previous year or ordered in the current year or soil test shows lime is not needed. Minimum pH is 6.5.
- f. On new seeding - pH for lime to be used - no test when using 2 tons per acre; on hay or pasture - no test required.
- g. Require 2 tons per acre unless test shows no need for lime.

5. Conservation Materials and Services

- a. Should we continue to furnish conservation materials under contract in 1965 as we did in 1964?

All counties voted "Yes."

C. 5. a.	Size of Bag	Type of Delivery			
		Bagged F.Y.	Bagged Siding	Bulk-spread	FOB Plant
<u>LIME</u>	<u>County</u>				
	Addison	80	x	x	x
	Bennington	80	x	x	x
	Caledonia	80	x	x	
	Chittenden	80	x	x	
	Essex	80	x	x	
	Franklin	100	x	x	
	Grand Isle	100	x	x	
	Lamoille	80		x	
	Orange	80	x	x	x
	Orleans	100	x	x	
	Rutland		x	x	x
	Washington	80	x	x	
	Windham		Purchase Order		x
	Windsor	80	x	x	x

SUPER Type of Delivery - Eleven counties voted for bagged siding; two counties voted for bagged farmyard; and one county voted for bagged farmyard and FOB plant delivery, with bulksread for super used under Practice 2.

One county wished to check on the use of granular material when the cost has been determined.

<u>MIXED</u>	<u>County</u>	0-15-30 or 0-25-25		0-15-30	Bagged Siding	Bagged F.Y.	FOB Plant	Bulk-spread
		0-25-25	0-25-25					
	Addison		x1/			x		
	Benn.		x		x			
	Cal.	x				x	x	
	Chitt.	x2/				x	x	x
	Essex	x				x	x	
	Franklin	x3/				x		
	Gr. I.		x			x	x	
	Lam.		x		x			
	Orange	x2/				4/		
	Orleans		x			x	x5/	
	Rutland		x6/		x			
	Washington	x				x	x	
	Windham	Purchase Order						
	Windsor			x	x			

1/ Wish to check on granular material when cost has been determined.

2/ 0-15-30 and 0-25-25.

3/ 0-20-20 or 0-25-25.

4/ Will decide on siding or farmyard after bids are opened.

5/ Also wish to offer 0-15-30 FOB plant.

6/ Also wish to offer 0-15-30 with boron at sidings and triple super and potash at sidings.

- C. 5. b. Purchase Order Plan - Indicate the type of material or service to be furnished under this plan:

<u>Kind of Service</u>	<u>Reply</u>	<u>No. Counties</u>
(1) Planting forest trees	Yes No	13 1
(2) Woodland improvement	Yes No	14 0
(3) Earth moving	Yes No	14 0
(4) Other: Bagged and BS Lime		1 (Bern.)
Lime		1 (Windham)
Mixed Fertilizer		1 (Windham)

- c. Should we continue the soil sampling service?

Yes 9 No 4 No answer 1

The following comments were made:

- (1) Use quick test kits.
- (2) Use quick test by committeemen and complete test where requested.
- (3) Use quick test by committeemen and other agencies.
- (4) Community committeemen test when requested; tell farmer to contact county agent for complete test.
- (5) Complete test by field assistant with reports to be available prior to sign-up; also use quick test at sign-up.

D. OTHER SUGGESTIONS

Four counties made the following suggestions:

1. Suggest that fertilizer company send card that mixed fertilizer or superphosphate will be delivered within three days and farmer must accept delivery within that period.
2. Put practice titles in capital letters in county handbook.
3. Try to educate farmers to take soil samples and have tests made.

- D. 4. The State should look into ways and means of getting more income out of existing land. On lots of farms that are going out of production, the owner is looking for some way of using the land.

Some states are doing a lot of research work on growing trees. Here in Vermont we have the most ideal land climate conditions, least trouble from insects and pests for tree growing, yet little is being done to encourage planting trees. In this county we have quite a lot of people growing trees and doing woodland improvement. There is a lot of information available on these subjects but people do not know where to go to get it.

Every year we are losing Christmas tree business to other States. The State of Vermont has done the least of any State about promoting this industry. It was pointed out that New Hampshire is doing much more than Vermont.

It is recommended that the State ASC Committee make a study of the Christmas Tree Program here in the State and see if there is anything the ASCS can do to help the industry.

OTHER CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

Conference Banquet

The guest speaker at the banquet was Ray Fitzgerald, Deputy Administrator, State and County Operations, ASCS, who discussed the committee system and the responsibilities of committeemen and office employees to give friendly and efficient service to farmers and others connected with our program.

Our toastmaster was Raymond G. Rowley, who served on the State Committee from 1961 to 1963 when he was appointed Commissioner of Agriculture for Vermont. Under Mr. Rowley's guidance the program for the evening was conducted in an interesting manner.

Others at the head table included:

Philip H. Hoff, Governor of Vermont, and Mrs. Hoff
Mrs. Raymond G. Rowley
Robert P. Davison, Director of Extension and Ex Officio
Member of State ASC Committee, and Mrs. Davison
Keith Wallace, President, Vermont State Farm Bureau, Inc.
H. L. Manwaring, Deputy Director, Conservation and Land Use
Policy Staff, ASCS
Harry Peters, Northeast Area Director, ASCS
Richard A. Moore, Chairman, State ASC Committee, and Mrs. Moore
J. Paul Bonneau, State ASC Committeeman, and Mrs. Bonneau
Morris E. LaFrance, State ASC Committeeman, and Mrs. LaFrance

The group was honored that Governor Hoff and Mrs. Hoff could be present and enjoyed the brief talk by the Governor on conservation work already accomplished and plans for meeting agricultural needs in the future. A special treat was the short message which Mrs. Hoff presented.

Robert P. Davison brought greetings from the College of Agriculture and University of Vermont and commented that, in his dual position of Director of Extension and State Committeeman, he was especially pleased to see the continued cooperation between Extension and ASCS.

The toastmaster called on Keith Wallace who extended the best wishes of the State Farm Bureau for a continued strong agricultural program. He stressed the fact that, although much had already been accomplished, there was still a great deal to be done, and that by working together farm problems could be solved over the years.

Harry Peters presented the State Committee with certificates of appointment and commented that he was pleased to have the opportunity to meet the group with whom H. W. Soule had had such a long association.

Group singing was led by Stuart Newton, Franklin County Committee Alumnus, with Mrs. Newton accompanying on the piano. Everyone enjoyed this change of pace and appreciated the courtesy and loyalty of the Newtons in providing the necessary leadership.

There were 116 at the banquet this year and the Hotel Vermont staff served an excellent beef dinner which was greatly enjoyed. At the close of the program the flowers from the head table were presented to Mrs. Moore as a token of appreciation for her serving as conference hostess.

ASCS Alumni

A special table at the banquet was reserved for ASCS alumni and their wives. The following were present this year:

Mr. and Mrs. Howard A. Foster, Salisbury)	
Mr. and Mrs. Park H. Newton, St. Albans)	
Mr. and Mrs. William Sinclair, Johnson)	State Committee
Mr. and Mrs. B. Frank Myott, Enosburg Falls)	
Hugh E. Evans, Brattleboro)	
Mr. and Mrs. Stuart Newton, St. Albans)	County Committee
Mr. and Mrs. Ray Collins, Colchester)	

Visitors from Cooperating Offices

We were pleased that the following representatives of cooperating agencies could attend sessions of the conference:

Harry Cooley, Member, Vermont State Soil Conservation Council,
Randolph Center

Robert Douglas, Swanton Lime Works, Inc., Swanton

George Dykhuizen, Professor of Philosophy, UVM and Former USDA
Consultant, Burlington

Dwight Eddy, Extension Agricultural Economist, Burlington

Ray Foulds, Extension Forester, Burlington

A. W. Gottlieb, Director of Forests, Montpelier

Richard Holmes, Deputy Director, Civil Defense, Montpelier

Richard Hopkins, State Soil Conservationist, SCS, Burlington

H. N. Hunsicker, Regional Planning Specialist, U. S. Office of
Education, Washington

Peter Keelty, Field Supervisor, Department of Employment
Security, Burlington

S. M. Martinetti, Farm Placement Supervisor, Department of
Employment Security, Montpelier

Tom McCormick, Assistant Extension Editor, Burlington

Mrs. Margaret Maurice, Extension Editorial Assistant, Burlington

L. J. Peet, State Conservationist, SCS, Burlington

H. S. Pringle, Northeast Coordinator of Civil Defense, Federal
Extension Service, Washington

Roger Seamans, Federal Aid Coordinator, Vermont Fish and Game
Service, Montpelier

William W. Stone, County Agent Leader and Rural Development
Specialist, Burlington

Noah Thompson, Rural Defense Information Specialist, Burlington

Cola Watson, Supervisor, Vocational Agriculture Education, Montpelier

Gerald B. Welsh, Watershed Work Plan Staff Leader, SCS, Burlington

Length-of-Service Awards

Certificates of recognition for the years of service rendered were presented to the following county personnel:

County Committeemen

15 Years	Norman Lowe, Caledonia County F. Milo Leighton, Orange County Myron Allen, Windham County
10 Years	Floyd Weld, Franklin County Roy Burroughs, Rutland County Everett Walbridge, Washington County

County Office Managers

20 Years	Mildred Murphy, Caledonia County
15 Years	Avis Maynard, Franklin County Mae Carpenter, Windham County
10 Years	Bethany French, Rutland County

Mr. Heald announced that similar certificates would be presented to the following personnel who were not present at the conference:

County Committeemen

25 Years	G. N. Baldwin, Chittenden County
15 Years	Chester Caswell, Grand Isle County L. E. Gregory, Lamoille County Arthur Stancliff, Lamoille County
10 Years	Robert Gaines, Windham County

County Office General Clerks

15 Years	Ruth Rann, Caledonia County
10 Years	Viola Chaffee, Franklin County

Tour of University Campus

On the afternoon of April 23, the wives attending the conference were conducted on a tour of the University of Vermont campus by a UVM student, Alan Lipkin. This tour was arranged through the courtesy of the Public Relations Office of UVM and the ladies very much appreciated the opportunity to go through many of the new University buildings.

Publicity

Throughout the conference photographers and local newsmen took pictures and interviewed speakers and guests. The local TV station used some of the pictures as a part of the day's local news and excellent coverage was provided by the local newspaper. We are indebted to the Vermont Extension Service Information Office for their excellent work in obtaining this coverage for us.

Exhibits

The general sessions of the conference were held in the Roof Garden where many charts and pictures of ASCS projects and accomplishments were on display. Those attending the conference found these exhibits most interesting and several of the speakers used the charts as reference material.

Photography

Through the courtesy of the Extension Service, Tom McCormick served as conference photographer. His cooperation and excellent photographs have provided us with a welcome picture record of this two-day meeting.

